THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME THIRTY-SEVEN THIRD QUARTER, 1943

James Russell Lowell's Ode

Recited at the Commemoration of the Living and Dead Soldiers of Harvard University, July 21, 1865

By HAMILTON VAUGHAN BAIL

ON July 21, 1865, Harvard College held a great commemorative service for those of its sons who had served the nation during the Civil War—to welcome home and pay homage to the survivors of its band of 590 alumni who had enlisted in the conflict and even more to honor the memory of those 99 noble sons who gave up their lives in their country's cause. It was the greatest day the college ever saw—the greatest celebration ever known since the foundation of the university.[1]

Next to the spontaneous, moving prayer delivered by Phillips Brooks at the church services in the morning—of which no record now remains—the most inspiring utterance of that day was the *Ode* recited in the late afternoon by James Russell Lowell. All else of that glorious occasion has long since been forgotten, but that *Commemoration Ode* still lives on.

[1] Hamilton Vaughan Bail. *Harvard's Commemoration Day, July 21, 1865.* In: *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. XV, June, 1942, pp. 256-279.

It was probably the third week in May that Professor Francis J. Child, chairman of the sub-committee in charge of the music and services for the ceremonies, asked Lowell to write this poem — evidently to be the grand peroration of the day. Lowell, at that time Smith Professor of the French and Spanish Languages and Literatures, and Professor of Belles-Lettres, was the logical selection for such a part in the program. He was still Harvard's most distinguished poet, although, as he himself had written a few years before, "while my lectures are on my mind I am not myself, and I seem to see all the poetry drying out of me."[2] Although his early poetic freedom and abandon had largely passed and although he had produced few poems during the war, in the few he had written — particularly in the *Biglow Papers, Second Series* — he had reached his earlier heights. But that which made Lowell's selection primarily fitting was his very closeness to the struggle. His naturally patriotic emotions had been at white heat during the entire four years of conflict, especially after the death in action of his three favorite nephews. Nobody else could so well speak in exalted verse for those whom that Commemoration Day was to honor. As far as Lowell himself was concerned it was fortunate, as Abbot Lawrence Lowell points out, that he was asked to deliver this *Ode,* for it may be doubted whether this, the grandest of his poems, would ever have been produced without the spur of necessity.[3]

Many have been the stories told of the great stress and strain under which Lowell composed his poem, after he had once accepted Child's invitation. Lowell himself describes or mentions its composition on a number of occasions. The most dramatic although obviously the most tenuous of these stories is that told to Horace E. Scudder about 1900 by Mrs. S. B. Herrick. On the evening before the celebration, with his poem still unwritten,

[2] Letter to W. J. Stillman dated May 14, 1857, printed in *Letters of James Russell Lowell* edited by Charles Eliot Norton, New York, 1894; I, p. 278. (Hereafter entitled *Letters.*)

[3] Massachusetts Historical Society. *Proceedings,* 2nd Series; XI, p. 91.

Lowell said to his wife: "I must write this poem tonight. Go to bed and do not let me feel that I am keeping you up, and I shall be more at ease." He began it at ten o'clock. At four in the morning he came to her door and said: "It is done and I am going to sleep now." She opened her eyes to see him standing haggard, actually wasted by the stress of labor and the excitement which had carried him through a poem of passion and fire, of 523 lines in the space of six hours.[4] This is the story which will doubtless be told through the years, but even so the actual facts should also be related.

It might be said that Lowell had really been working on his *Ode* for four years. Edward Everett Hale points out that the inspiration had come from day to day during the long years of the war and he poured out in the poem what he had been thinking and feeling, in joy and sorrow, in hope and fear, in learning and forgetting, for all that period of crisis and strain.[5] But uncrystallized ideas do not make a poem. Lowell himself said that the germ of a poem (the *idée-mère*) was always delightful but that he had no pleasure in working it up.[6] Even with two months to spend on his task it seems probable that he delayed translating his war-time passion and feelings into the verses of his *Ode* until the end of the period. An attack of the gout during late May certainly could not have increased his incentive to work. Furthermore, as president of the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Harvard, he must have had very much on his mind the arrangements for the Society's annual meeting the day after Commencement. He had evidently accomplished so little that — with the great day looming upon him — he dejectedly told Child that he should expect nothing from him,[7] that he was dull as a door-mat.[8] All this does

[4] Horace Elisha Scudder. *James Russell Lowell A Biography*, Boston, 1901, II, p. 65, note.

[5] Edward Everett Hale. *James Russell Lowell and His Friends*, Boston, 1899, p. 188.

[6] Letter to James B. Thayer in *Letters*, II, p. 8; quoted on page 176 infra.

[7] Letter to William James, in Scudder, op. cit., II, p. 67, note.

[8] Letter to R. W. Gilder dated January 16, 1886, in *Letters*, II, p. 304.

not mean, however, that nothing had been done. Certainly by the time alumni had begun to pour into Cambridge for Commencement on July 19 Lowell had composed substantial portions of the *Ode* — so substantial that he could write: "Did I not for two days exasperate everybody that came near me by reciting passages in order to try them on?"[9]

These passages which Lowell was reciting to everybody could hardly have been composed during the two days immediately prior to the celebration. Certainly nothing was done on Commencement Day; we know that he was present at the church in the morning because Mrs. William Wetmore Story wrote to her daughter: "We met many an old friend there, and it went straight to my heart to see papa walking arm-in-arm with James Lowell."[10] And of the afternoon Lowell himself wrote: "[Story] and two more came up hither after dinner [Commencement], and we talked and laughed and smoked and drank Domdechanei till there wasn't a bald head nor a gray hair among us. — I forgot for a few blessed hours that I was a professor, and felt as if I were something real." And continuing he writes: "But Phi Beta came next day, and *wasn't* I tired! Presiding from 9 A.M. till 6½ P.M. is no joke,"— and so there could hardly have been any work on the *Ode* that day; but still continuing, he writes: "and then up next morning at ½ past 4 to copy out and finish my ode."[11] And so it would seem that by Commencement Day on July 19th Lowell already had his *idée-mère,* already had sufficient passages and stanzas to try out on his friends, and only rose early on the morning of Commemoration Day to "copy out and finish" the ode.

This is the story as written four and five days after the event itself when the actual circumstances were entirely fresh in his memory, Lowell's own statements made many years later to the

[9] Letter to Jane Norton, quoted on page 178 infra.

[10] Henry James. *William Wetmore Story and His Friends,* Boston, 1903, p. 174.

[11] Letter to Jane Norton, in *Letters,* I, p. 345.

contrary notwithstanding. One such statement was the following: "I sat up all the night before the ceremony, writing and copying out what I had written during the day. I think most of it was composed on that last day."[12] Another was: "The ode itself was an improvisation. Two days before the Commemoration I had told my friend Child that it was impossible — that I was dull as a door-mat. But the next day something gave me a jog and the whole thing came out of me with a rush. I sat up all night writing it out clear."[13] And still another was this: "The 'Commemoration Ode,' with the exception of the passage about Lincoln, was wholly composed in the two days before that on which it was to be delivered, mainly in the latter of the two. I sat up [changed to *spent*] all the last night in copying & finishing it. Till it thus came with a rush, I had given up all hope of being able to write anything for that truly sublime occasion, as my friend Professor Child, who asked it of me will remember."[14]

That final fair copy written during the early hours of Commemoration Day was at least written with a vehement speed which Lowell thought he had lost in the skirts of his professor's gown. That speed and the fact that he was "so rapt with the fervor of conception" as he had not been in ten years, losing sleep, appetite, and flesh, tended to make him so nervous that he was weeks in getting over it. "Virtue enough had gone out of me to make me weak for a fortnight after," he wrote.

Early the next morning, before the alumni had begun to arrive for their ten o'clock assembly at Gore Hall for the procession to the church, Lowell took Child aside in the Yard under an elm between Massachusetts and old Dane Halls (in the present Matthews quadrangle) to have him read parts of the *Ode*. "I

[12] Letter to William James, in Scudder, op. cit., II, p. 67, note.

[13] Letter to R. W. Gilder, as cited.

[14] This extract is taken from a manuscript in Lowell's hand now owned by Carroll A. Wilson entitled "Prefatory Note to the Poems," which was evidently written for the final edition of his poems. Only the first part (not here quoted) actually appeared in print, however.

have something, but don't yet know what it is, or whether it will do. Look at it and tell me." Child read a passage here and there, brought it back, and said, "Do? I should think so! Don't you be scared."[15] Lowell also recited it that morning to John Holmes and William Story, "both of 'em fervently declaring it was 'noble' " with tears in their eyes. He tried it out on "the silent Rowse" who declared " 'twas in a higher mood than much or most of later verse."[16]

The finished poem which Lowell showed to Child and his other friends that morning is a loose, irregular ode with unequal and unbalanced verses and broken stanzas in the form of the odes of Pindar with their strophes, antistrophes and epodes written to be chanted by a chorus—or rather in the form of the structureless Pindarics invented by Cowley and adopted by a long line of successors—Dryden, Pope, Wordsworth, Shelley, Coleridge and others.

About no other of his poems has Lowell written so fully in explanation of form and content as he has about this *Commemoration Ode*. In a long letter to James B. Thayer on January 14, 1877, he explained his reasons for adopting the form he used:

> But what I wished to say a word to you about (since you are so generous in your judgment) is the measures I have chosen in these as well as the "Commemoration Ode." I am induced to this by reading in an article on Cowley copied into the *Living Age* from the *Cornhill* (and a very good article too, in the main) the following passage, "As lately as our own day" (*my* ear would require "*So* lately as," by the way) "Mr. Lowell's 'Commemoration Ode' is a specimen of the formless poem of unequal lines and broken stanzas supposed to be in the manner of Pindar, but truly the descendant of our royalist poet's 'majestick numbers.' " Now, whatever my other shortcomings (and they are plenty, as none knows better than I), want of reflection is not one of them. The poems were all intended for public recitation. That was the first thing to be considered. I suppose my ear (from long and painful practice on Φ.B.K. poems) has more technical experience in this than almost any. The least tedious measure is the rhymed heroic, but this, too, palls unless relieved by passages of wit or even mere fun. A long series of uniform stanzas (I am always speaking of public recitation) with regularly recurring rhymes produces somnolence among the men

[15] Letter to R. W. Gilder, as cited.

[16] Letter to Jane Norton, quoted on page 178 infra.

and a desperate resort to their fans on the part of the women. No method has yet been invented by which the train of thought or feeling can be shunted off from the epical to the lyrical track. My ears have been jolted often enough over the sleepers on such occasions to know that. I know *something* (of course an American can't know much) about Pindar. But *his* odes had the advantage of being chanted. Now, my problem was to contrive a measure which should not be tedious by uniformity, which should vary with varying moods, in which the transitions (including those of the voice) should be managed without jar. I at first thought of mixed rhymed and blank verses of unequal measures, like those of the choruses of "Samson Agonistes," which are in the main masterly. Of course, Milton *deliberately* departed from that stricter form of the Greek Chorus to which it was bound quite as much (I suspect) by the law of its musical accompaniment as by any sense of symmetry. I wrote some stanzas of the "Commemoration Ode" on this theory at first, leaving some verses without a rhyme to match. But my ear was better pleased when the rhyme, coming at a longer interval, as a far-off echo rather than instant reverberation, produced the same effect almost, and yet was grateful by unexpectedly recalling an association and faint reminiscence of consonance. I think I have succeeded pretty well, and if you try reading aloud I believe you would agree with me. . . .

The *Cornhill* writer adds that "Keats, Shelley, and Swinburne, on the other hand, have restored to the ode its harmony and shapeliness." He and I have different notions of harmony. He evidently means uniformity of recurrence. It isn't true of Shelley, some of whose odes certainly were written on the Cowley model. All of Wordsworth's are, except the "Power of Sound" and the "Immortality," which is irregular, but whose cadences were learned of Gray. (— Gray's odes are regular.) Coleridge's are also Cowleian in form, I am pretty sure. But all these were written for the closet — and mine for recitation. I chose my measures with my ears open. So I did in writing the poems on Rob Shaw. That *is* regular because meant only to be read, and because also I thought it should have in the form of its stanza something of the formality of an epitaph.

Pardon me all this. But I could not help wishing to leave in friendly hands a protest against being thought a lazy rhymer who wrote in *numeris* that seem, but are not, *lege solutis,* because it was easier. It isn't easier, if it be done well, that is, if it attain to a real and not a merely visual harmony of verse. The mind should be rhymed to, as well as the ear and eye. *Mere* uniformity gives the columns and wings and things of Herbert and Quarles. If I had had more time to mull over my staves they would have been better.[17]

Previously on December 8, 1868, Lowell had also answered some doubts and queries which Thayer had raised in a review of the poem.[18] Lowell wrote:

[17] *Letters,* II, p. 188.

[18] For this review see page 187 infra.

I have never meddled with any criticism of what I write, nor am I very sensitive about it, having long ago made up my mind that whatever was good would make its own way at last. But how could I be other than pleased with your "notice" of my book in the *Daily Advertiser?* It was sympathetic, and what more could one ask? . . .

I don't know how to answer your queries about my "Ode." I *guess* I am right, for it was a matter of pure instinct — except the strophe you quote, [the new one first appearing in *Under the Willows*] which I added for balance both of measure and thought. I am not sure if I understand what you say about the tenth strophe. You will observe that it leads naturally to the eleventh, and that I there justify a certain narrowness in it as an expression of the popular feeling as well as my own. I confess I have never got over the feeling of wrath with which (just after the death of my nephew Willie) I read in an English paper that nothing was to be hoped of an army officered by tailors' apprentices and butcher-boys. The poem was written with a vehement speed, which I thought I had lost in the skirts of my professor's gown. Till within two days of the celebration I was hopelessly dumb, and then it all came with a rush, literally making me lean (*mi fece magro*), and so nervous that I was weeks in getting over it. I was longer in getting the new (eleventh) [Lowell means the ninth] strophe to my mind than in writing the rest of the poem. In *that* I hardly changed a word, and it was so undeliberate that I did not find out until after it was printed that some of the verses lacked corresponding rhymes. All the "*War Poems*" were improvisations, as it were. My blood was up, and you would hardly believe me if I were to tell you few hours intervened between conception and completion, even in so long a one as "Mason and Slidell." So I have a kind of faith that the "Ode" is right because it was *there*, I hardly knew how. I doubt you are right in wishing it more historical. But then I could not have written it. I had put the ethical and political view so often in prose that I was weary of it. The motives of the war? I had impatiently argued them again and again — but for an ode they must be in the blood and not the memory. . . .

It bothers me sometimes in writing verses. The germ of a poem (the *idée-mère*) is always delightful to me, but I have no pleasure in working it up. I carry them in my head sometimes for years before they insist on being written. . . .[19]

The program for that Commemoration Day called for services in the Unitarian Church in the forenoon followed, after an intermission of an hour or two, by a dinner with speeches, music, poems, etc. in a great pavilion taking up the entire quadrangle between Holden Chapel, Hollis Hall, Harvard Hall and the street. It was at the very end of the afternoon near the close of

[19] *Letters*, II, p. 8.

the program that Charles G. Loring called upon Lowell to read his *Ode*. It was probably already after six o'clock when he was introduced and many had left the tent. He read from his seat under the huge Harvard coat-of-arms on the wall of Hollis near which he was sitting with his class of 1838.[20]

Although Edward Everett Hale who was present has written: "His own intense interest was evident enough, but it was reflected in what I might call the passionate interest with which people heard";[21] and although Abbot Lawrence Lowell has said: "His delivery, usually cold, was impassioned, and the people in the broad tent spread near the college grounds were profoundly moved,"[22] general evidence indicates that to most listeners that afternoon the *Ode* was not a great success even though actually written to be declaimed. Both the *New York Herald* and the *New York Tribune* failed to mention it — possibly their reporters were among those who had left. The best that the *New York Times* representative could say was: "The poet, James Russell Lowell, was next introduced, and received with great applause. He proceeded to read a beautiful poem, of which it is the highest praise to say it was worthy of its distinguished author. I regret not being able to send you a copy." *The Daily Evening Traveller* of Boston merely said: "Prof. Jas. Russell Lowell read an eloquent poem." But it was the words of the *Boston Daily Advertiser* which really seared the soul of Lowell: "Professor James Russell Lowell was

[20] In a letter to me dated December 2, 1939, Mrs. Elizabeth D. Worcester, daughter of the Rev. Thomas Hill, President of Harvard at the time of the Commemoration, has written: "I am especially interested in that Ode as I imagine I am one of the very few now living who heard it when given. I say 'heard it,' but it was not with any understanding of what was being said. A kind policeman lifted up a flap of the huge tent where the exercises were going on, & let my little sister & me crawl in under it. I remember as though it were yesterday looking across that great sea of heads & seeing Mr. Lowell standing there, & hearing his voice."

For an interesting psychic manifestation of the delivery of the Ode, too long to be quoted here, see two letters written to William James by Charles P. Ware and Lowell, first published in the *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research* for March, 1889, Vol. I, p. 373, and subsequently reprinted in great part in Scudder, op. cit., II, p. 67, note.

[21] *James Russell Lowell and His Friends*, p. 188.

[22] Massachusetts Historical Society. *Proceedings*, 2nd Series, XI, p. 91.

next introduced, and read a graceful poem, which was received with the most decided demonstrations of satisfaction."

It is no wonder that the sensitive Lowell with wistful dejection should have poured out his heart to Jane Norton in a letter four days later:

. . . I am here among my books and I am in a literal sense alive. I eat and smoke and sleep and go through all the nobler functions of man mechanically still, and wonder at myself as at something outside of and alien to Me. For have I not worked myself lean on an "Ode for Commemoration"? Was I not so rapt with the fervor of conception as I have not been these ten years, losing my sleep, my appetite, and my flesh, those attributes to which I before alluded as nobly uniting us in a common nature with our kind? Did I not for two days exasperate everybody that came near me by reciting passages in order to try them on? Did I not even fall backward and downward to the old folly of hopeful youth, and think I had written something *really* good at last? And am I not now enduring those retributive dumps which ever follow such sinful exultations, the Erynnyes of Vanity? Did not I make John Holmes and William Story shed tears by my recitation of it (my ode) in the morning, both of 'em fervently declaring it was "noble"? Did not even the silent Rowse declare 'twas in a higher mood than much or most of later verse? Did not I think, in my nervous exhilaration, that 'twould be *the* feature (as reporters call it) of the day? And, after all, have I not a line in the *Daily Advertiser* calling it a "graceful poem" (or "some graceful verses," I forget which), which was "received with applause"? Why, Jane, my legs are those of grasshoppers, and my head is an autumn threshing-floor, still beating with alternate flails of strophe and antistrophe, and an infinite virtue has gone out of me somehow — but it seems *not* into my verse as I had dreamed. Well, well, Charles will like it — but then he always does, so what's the use? I am Icarus now with the cold salt sea over him instead of the warm exulting blue of ether. I am gone under, and I will never be a fool again. You read between the lines, don't you, ... You know my foibles . . . . Like a boy, I mistook my excitement for inspiration, and here I am in the mud. You see also I am a little disappointed and a little few (*un petit peu*) vexed. I did *not* make the hit I expected, and am ashamed at having been again tempted into thinking I could write *poetry*, a delusion from which I have been tolerably free these dozen years. . . .

And continuing the next day he wrote:

I have not got cool yet (I mean as to nerves), and lie awake at night thinking how much better my verses might have been, only I can't make 'em so. Well, I am

printing fifty copies in 4to, and Charles will like it, as I said before, and I sha'n't, because I thought too well of it at first.[23]

It is only fair to say that it was not unusual for Lowell to climb to the heights of emotional exhilaration in the composition of a poem only later to fall far down into the depths of despair — he often tasted his champagne the next morning, as he has said.

There were some, however, who even on that day sensed the true significance of the *Ode*, so that Lowell's melancholy pessimism was not entirely justified even then. Mrs. James T. Fields wrote in her diary the following day: "What an ever-memorable day, the one at Harvard! The prayer of Phillips Brooks, the ode of Lowell, the address of Dr. Putnam and the Governor, and the heartfelt verses of Holmes, and the lovely music and the hymns. But Lowell's Ode!! How it overtops the whole of what is preserved on paper beside!"[24] In a letter to her daughter three days after the celebration Mrs. Story wrote: "There too James Lowell read a very fine poem, full of spirit and pathos."[25] John S. Dwight speaks of the fine events of the day, "especially a very noble poem by James Russell Lowell."[26]

But in spite of all expressions of appreciation and admiration it seems evident that the *Ode* was not the feature of the day — not the great peroration of the celebration. Scudder well explains the reason:

> The Ode did not at once assert its high character, yet it must be borne in mind that the very reason of its form acted somewhat against its immediate popularity. It is truly an ode to be recited, and as a chorus depends for its power upon a volume of sound, so this ode needs, to bring out its full value, a great delivery. Lowell himself, always a sympathetic reader, had no such power of recitation as would at once convey to his audience a notion of the stateliness and procession of words which attaches to the ode. — Lowell's explanation of the form of the ode

[23] Original letter in Harvard College Library, printed in great part in *Letters*, I, p. 345.

[24] M. A. DeWolfe Howe, editor. *Memories of a Hostess A Chronicle of Eminent Friendships drawn chiefly from the Diaries of Mrs. James T. Fields*, Boston, 1922, p. 36, note.

[25] *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, p. 174.

[26] *Dwight's Journal of Music*, August 5, 1865.

is significant. So native to him was the most genuine literary spirit that he could conceive of the ode and its delivery as one consistent whole without being perturbed by the consideration that he was to deliver it and to a modern audience trained in the reading of poetry, not in the hearing of it. Both the poetic reciter and the recipients were wanting, and the ode remains, a noble piece of declamation indeed for whoever has the great gift of poetic declamation, yet after all as surely to be read and not spoken as Browning's dramas are to be read and not acted.[27]

Although Lowell made plans immediately after the celebration (or probably before) to print fifty copies of the *Ode*, it first appeared in print in *The Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1865, with the title, *Ode Recited at the Harvard Commemoration, July 21, 1865*, but with no indication of the author in the table of contents or elsewhere, as was usual for that magazine at that time. On August 25, 1865, this number of the *Atlantic* was first advertised as being ready. Over a week later on September 3rd Lowell sat down and wrote presentation inscriptions in the fifty copies of that privately printed edition with the title-page: *Ode* | *Recited at the* | *Commemoration* [in red] | *of* | *The Living and Dead Soldiers* | *of Harvard University*, | *July 21, 1865.* | *By James Russell Lowell.* | (Harvard Arms) | *Cambridge:* [in red] | *Privately Printed.* | *1865.* |.

If the reception of the *Ode* at the Commemoration celebration had been lukewarm, there is no question but that its real greatness was immediately appreciated when it had once been seen in print with its powerful additional stanza on Lincoln. Referring again to Mrs. Fields's diary the following entry is found under date of September 6: "Mr. Emerson went to see Mr. Fields. 'There are fine lines in Lowell's Ode,' he said. 'Yes,' answered J. T. F., 'it is a fine poem.' 'I have found fine lines in it,' replied the seer. 'I told Lowell once,' he continued, 'that his humorous poems gave me great pleasure; they were worth all his serious poetry. He did not take it very well, but muttered, "The Washers of the Shroud," and walked away.' "[28]

[27] Scudder, op. cit., II, p. 68.

[28] *Memories of a Hostess*, p. 90.

Emerson wrote directly to Lowell as follows on September 17th:

I send you warm thanks, if late, for the admirable Ode. I shall always be sorry that I did not hear it. The eighth strophe, with its passion & its vision, was made to be spoken. The technical skill shown throughout is masterly, & yet subordinated by the high thought & sentiment of the piece, which make me glad & proud of it as a national poem. When you shall collect your recent poems in a book, I hope you will drop from this the one or two needless reminders of Tennyson, & I shall affirm with joy, against any possible previous speeches of my own to you, that your eminent success with the comic muse has in no wise hindered you from the command of all the resources of the noble & serious goddess.[29]

George W. Curtis sent his encomiums in a letter dated September 12:

I thank you with all my heart for the noble ode which with all my heart I have read & enjoyed. Certainly you have done nothing in a loftier strain. — nor has anything more truly worthy of the great theme been written. If it is very serious and very sad it is for the same reason that the sky is blue and the corn yellow. I have read it aloud to Anna, and read it and re-read it to myself: and I am sure it says what the truest American heart feels and believes. And if that is not a worth while doing — if a man *can* do it — what is? . . .[30]

Four days later Sydney Howard Gay added his compliments:

Let me thank you most patriotically for your noble poem which has y^e^ old & true ring in it of y^e^ weapons which I had almost begun to fear you had forgotten how to use; & most sincerely & tenderly that you count me among your fifty friends. It is a beautiful book, worthy its contents, worthy its two dedications — especially worthy y^e^ names of those noble young sons of our good old mother state who were fit to die for her, & whose memory you thus help to keep green forever. . . .[31]

On September 21st both James Freeman Clarke and Richard Grant White wrote letters of praise; the former said:

I was so unfortunate as to leave the tent, on Commemoration Day, before you read your Ode. It is only two or three days since I read it in the Atlantic. I find it impossible to deny myself the pleasure of saying to you how deeply it has

[29] Original letter in Harvard College Library, printed in *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* edited by Ralph L. Rusk, New York, 1939, V, p. 425.

[30] Original letter in Harvard College Library.

[31] Original letter in Harvard College Library.

thrilled me, & how I rejoice that this grand, tender, noble song, has been inspired for this great hour of the Nation. It was hardly to be hoped that anything at all adequate could be said or sung. But if I can at all trust a profound sentiment, your poem is to be as immortal as the time whose grandeur of tone it takes, whose flaming light illumines it. There has been as little said about the Poem as about the Peace. The Peace came upon us with victory, and we scarcely knew when. So greatest events arrive — so come birth, death, sunrise, summer; with no abrupt transition, & no sound of trumpets or moving gun. — Your Poem seems to have arrived in the same way — no one saying "Lo here! or Lo there!" — I have read it twice, aloud, to my family — & its solemn sweetness has penetrated all our hearts.[32]

And the latter wrote:

Thanks for the copy of the privately printed edition of your Commemoration Ode. To be remembered by you among fifty is very gratifying to me who have so little claim upon your regard other than the high value that I set upon it. I had not seen the ode before, & I read it last evening. It lasted two pipes very pleasant ones. I'm not going to pay you in praise for your beautiful book (which, by the way, has such a distinguished look in the real old-fashioned boards) — because I would not presume to offer that kind of chaff to you, O High-worthy Mister. But I wont be prevented from saying that I take mightily to your epithet "sure-footed" for Lincoln's mind — that the passage "Be proud for she is saved" stirred me deeply — & that perhaps most of all I was pleased with the line in which you say that certain relaxing lips "The rosy edges of their smile lay bare."

I have very grave doubts about "innative weakness." Surely *in* is not negative? But if not, what is "innative" more than "native"? [33]

Edward Everett Hale had this to say:

I was out of town when the beautiful copy of your Ode arrived, or I should have thanked you for it earlier. Of course I had read the Ode with great pleasure already — I am delighted to keep it in this sumptuous form for my children to grow up to —

There are passages in it that the boys of generation upon generation will speak at school — and that will be remembered and repeated when people do not know whether Bull Run was a victory or a defeat —

Does it ever occur to you that in this generation men do not know whether Marston Moor or Naseby were decided on the right or wrong side? Yet ninety years ago "Cromwell's head" was a tavern sign in School Street.

[32] Original letter in Harvard College Library.

[33] Original letter in Harvard College Library.

Thanking you heartily for remembering me in your distribution I am always Yrs.[34]

John Weiss on October 11th made particular note of the significance of the *Ode:*

The early copy of the Comemoration Ode which you were so kind as to send me, came on the eve of our flitting to another house. Now for the first time I find a pen to thank you. This, and your "76," and Bryant's "Not Yet," remain the permanent contributions of poetic fire to the Country whose literature has been stirred by war. It tempts me to write its merits, delicate and lofty, that perchance it may become better regarded and duly honored. Because anybody can stop and cry "Look." Then if there is something to see, the crowd is glad.

But I fancy you would prefer to crave from Milton the loan of those ears which listened earliest and keenest to his "Lycidas," or to win half of Shakespeare's secret by gaining such as heard his sonnets first.

In the meantime, there is in it for me not a line too much, nor one below the sacrifice that is commemorated. And what a delight it is to admire it.[35]

On September 10th Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar also wrote:

Many thanks for your beautiful book, which the mail brought punctually to hand, and which "No. 7" of your friends received with pride and pleasure.

I cannot compare the poem with all that has made you famous, because it has no relation to such things as "Bigelow Papers" "Fable for Critics," and so on. But it has affected me more, in hearing and reading, than anything of yours of the serious kind; and I think its tone lofty and noble, and the execution worthy of the theme.

What an occasion that Commemoration was! Why! It was the whole war concentrated, and you have embalmed its essence and its flavor forever. . . .

I still think the best line in the poem is

That is best blood which hath most iron in't,

but there are whole strophes that I have read over many times with delight, and should be glad to hear you read again. . . .[36]

On March 26, 1867, Thomas Wentworth Higginson wrote to Lowell in these words:

[34] Original letter dated October 4, 1865, owned by Hon. Hanford McNider, Mason City, Iowa.

[35] Original letter in Harvard College Library.

[36] Letter printed in *Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar A Memoir* by Moorfield Storey and Edward W. Emerson, Boston, 1911, p. 155.

In the new edition of the Harvard Biographies, your great poem will of course reappear. It is in my poor Judgment not merely your chef d'oeuvre — helping to reconcile your friends to your long silences, — but also the first of American poems, thus far. This shows with what modesty I must criticize even what seems to me its sole weak point, however small — the word "and" in the 5th stanza line 13. I cannot disengage it from the word "ere" with which it has, in meaning, no connexion. Surely, when the cannon's lips are lightest, the sword has ceased to dream. To my ear *and* should read *while*, & even that does not disentangle the sentence without a dash (—) before it, to detach it in time from the clause just preceding. Or if it were

"and the sword
Leaps from its easeful sheath;"

then the two dependent clauses would correspond. Now that I have written this, it seems like an impertinence, but I may as well let it go. . . .[37]

Subsequent reviewers and commentators have written much about the *Commemoration Ode*. Henry James uses these words:

A wealth of eloquence and cheer had attended the Harvard celebration of the return of Peace, — but the climax had been Lowell's delivery of his noble Commemoration Ode, as to which one now sees — as to which one even then perhaps mutely, mystically made out — that a great thing that was to live had been but half-notedly born.[38]

Scudder says that in no other single poem except Whitman's *My Captain* does the young American born since the war have his emotions so kindled. The characterization of Lincoln — probably more often read and quoted than any other parts of the *Ode* — is so completely imbedded in it and so spontaneous that it gives no sense of being an afterthought. "Into these three score lines Lowell has poured a conception of Lincoln which may justly be said to be today the accepted idea which Americans hold of their great president." Lowell was the first of the leading American writers to see and proclaim the greatness of Lincoln. This recognition was a matter of development on Lowell's part; he never saw Lincoln.[39]

[37] Original letter in Harvard College Library; Lowell's answer is found in *Letters*, I, p. 379; and is also quoted on pages 192, 196, 197 and 199 infra.

[38] *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, p. 176.

[39] Scudder, op. cit., II, p. 68.

Apropos of this particular stanza Lowell himself wrote:

> The passage about Lincoln was not in the ode as originally recited, but added immediately after. More than eighteen months before, however, I had written about Lincoln in the *North American Review* — an article which pleased him. I *did* divine him earlier than most men of the Brahmin caste.[40]

In 1885 Edmund Clarence Stedman wrote a detailed and appreciative criticism of the *Ode* and its nobility of feeling, in the course of which he calls it "no smooth-cut block from Pentelicus, but a mass of rugged quartz, beautified with prismatic crystals, and deep-veined here and there with virgin gold."[41]

Ferris Greenslet likewise has written a pertinent analysis of the work. He says that on this the greatest occasion of his life, Lowell gave expression to what is one of the great occasional poems of the world.[42]

At a much later day on November 15, 1918, we find Henry Lee Higginson writing to Sir Hugh Levick:

> On Monday morning at five o'clock, — that is before light, — the whistles began to blow and the bells to ring, and they did not stop for twenty-four hours. . . . the relief and joy were very great. . . . Comments are unnecessary. Two or three lines keep coming to me. One of them is Mr. Lowell's ode when the Harvard men came home from the Civil War. One stanza begins: "Bow down, dear land, for thou hast found release," and it is so strong that I never repeat it without my voice breaking. . . .[43]

Only the year before at the 1917 Commencement exercises at Harvard, Higginson had ended his short and strong appeal for help in the struggle, with the last five lines of the *Ode*, so moved that he could not utter another word.[44]

And finally as recently as the year 1940 President Shuster of Hunter College had this to say:

[40] Letter to R. W. Gilder, as cited.

[41] Edmund Clarence Stedman. *Poets of America*, Cambridge, 1885, II, p. 343.

[42] Ferris Greenslet. *James Russell Lowell His Life and Work*, Boston, 1905, p. 160.

[43] Bliss Perry. *Life and Letters of Henry Lee Higginson*, Boston, 1921, p. 518.

[44] Edward W. Emerson. *The Early Years of the Saturday Club*, Boston, 1918, p. 401, note.

The great American panegyrical ode is Lowell's "Commemoration Ode," read on July 21, 1865. Granted that it is uneven and wearying long, the best passages are very good, indeed. The sixth stanza, which begins,

> Such was he, our Martyr-Chief,
> Whom late the Nation he had led,
> With ashes on her head,
> Wept with the passion of an angry grief:,

is as illustrious a hymn of praise as our verse affords. These chaste, forthright, heartfelt sentences established a myth to which generations of Americans have turned almost unquestioningly; and though the sign under which they were born was rhetoric rather than metrical music, it is no meager praise to say that in them image, terse statement, and genial warmth of rhythm were combined.[45]

In a review in 1869 of *Under the Willows and Other Poems* in which the *Ode* was first collected, William Dean Howells says that of itself this ode could make us believe that the war had produced a literature. After quoting the third stanza he writes:

One shudders at the thought of certain poor old combinations of adjectives, well enough for common use, being made to stand for an appreciation of this poem. There is something like warning in its superb completeness; compliment is not for the reverence which unseals the poet's lips in self-doubt, nor the triumph which closes them upon those words of tender and sublime exultance,—

"Bow down, dear Land, for thou hast found release!"

There is reason given for all the faith and love in the poem; there is no appeal to mere emotion, nor the noisiness of transport, whatever fervor; its most exalted feeling is in an impassioned study; what is likest rapture is the thrill of uttering divine fact; yet with all its severe and predominant intellectual qualities,— and let us remember that he who said poetry should be "simple, sensuous, passionate," left making such poetry to his inferiors,— it is richer than any other poem of its kind in the delights of art, in form, in music, in grace of movement, in vivid and heroic pictures.[46]

In another review of the same book James B. Thayer said that the two crowning pieces of the volume were the *Ode* and *Memoriae Positum:*

[45] George N. Shuster. *The English Ode from Milton to Keats*, New York, 1940, p. 281, note.

[46] *The Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1869, XXIII, p. 262.

As to the "Commemoration Ode," no one who heard it when it was first recited will easily forget either the poem or the reading of it. Surely there are none of our war poems to compare with this one, unless it be the author's own. As it is now printed, a whole new section, the ninth, has been added to the version heretofore published.

He then proceeds to quote the greater part of this new "thoughtful, strong, imaginative strain," and asks where in contemporary poetry, unless in Emerson's "Threnody," shall one go for such passages; and he asks what there is to compare with the superb and passionate ending of the ode, which he also quotes.

It is but a poor business when so great a gift as this is before us, to find fault with it or to ask whether it might not have been better. Two or three things one might say, but we are hardly clear enough in our impression to suggest them.— Does not the poet in some places celebrate over-much and with too ingenious a fancy the littleness of mankind and certain painful questionings that afflict them? — Might not the tenth section well enough have been dropped? — And was not something to have been gained in such a poem, by calling up with more distinctness certain great characteristics of the war? [47]

In 1869 the Rev. W. C. Wilkinson wrote an excellent review of Lowell's poetry—detailed and didactic.[48] Much concerns the *Commemoration Ode*. He notes that in repeated perusals of almost any one of Mr. Lowell's poems they never seem less beautiful than they did at first, but they seldom seem more beautiful. He calls this ode a notable exception to this remark, however, being the most elevated in aspiration of all his poems and ranking in the peerage of the very few greatest odes in the English language. He regards the Lincoln strophe as "the Kohinoor, to which all that precedes and all that follows is magnificent setting. There are almost no blemishes in the perfection of this noble passage." Although its source is rather inaccessible, the whole review is too long to print here, but the praise given to the poem as a whole is so tempered by wise and relevant criticism that it is evi-

[47] *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Supplement, Saturday morning, December 5, 1868. See page 176 infra for Lowell's letter in reply to this review.

[48] *Mr. Lowell's Poetry*, in *The Baptist Quarterly*, October, 1869, III, pp. 436-463.

dent the author had a much clearer perception of Lowell's strength and weakness—in this poem as in all his work—than most of his better-known contemporaries and successors.

Two English reviews of *Under the Willows* have comments about the *Ode* which are also interesting and to the point. As in the case of the preceding reviewer the authors certainly could not be accused of being members of Boston's mutual admiration society.

The unknown writer in the *Athenaeum* for April 17, 1869, is especially eulogistic about the *Poems of the War* in which group the *Commemoration Ode* is found: "They go to the heart like a strain of grand music, or like that most thrilling of all human sounds, the voice of a multitude raised in song." He calls the *Ode* a noble poem, and in quoting the last stanza and a half, speaks of it as a noble picture of America sitting down in peace, and of the position she will take in the new order that is arising out of the old.

> America has often "vaunted herself" and been vulgarized by the bragging and boasting of her own people. She has not been made to look lovely in the eyes of men who were not her sons; but Mr. Lowell invests America with an ideal grace which gives her beauty we did not own before.

The reviewer in *The Spectator* for February 6, 1869, calling Lowell the only really original poet America had yet produced, spends about half his article (reprinted in *Littell's Living Age* for March 13, 1869) comparing Lowell and Wordsworth. He picks out for quotation the sixth stanza about Lincoln as the most original and finest thing the volume contained and writes:

> That most childlike and most sagacious of modern rulers is painted in colours that will, we may safely assert, last as long as the history of that great struggle, and be resorted to — till the American people ceases to brood over its own greatest deeds — as the one *locus classicus* to generation after generation for a portrait of the greatest, simplest, and most characteristic figure of the conflict —

a portrait which he calls finer as well as more individual than Wordsworth's *Happy Warrior* itself. He says that this portrait

makes us feel the touch of the genuine poet, who, the deeper may be his insight into human nature at large, will only feel the more enthusiasm for those national and local virtues into which it has been his inheritance to gain a still fuller insight.

Still later another Englishman, "F. T.," in a fine critical study of Lowell and his writings entitled *Mr. Lowell's Poems* in *The Cornhill Magazine* for January, 1875, wrote:

> . . . But in the "Commemoration Ode," he has found an appropriate occasion and form for pouring out his strongest feelings in masculine verse. One or two stanzas even here may be a little too didactic; and the style is rather broad and manly than marked by the exquisite felicities which betray the hand of a perfect master. But throughout the ode the stream of song flows at once strong and deep. The poet is speaking from his heart, and with a solemnity, a pathos, and elevation of feeling worthy of a great event. Few official copies of verses, composed by invitation on set occasions, escape the condemnation of coldness and formality. Little would be lost to our literature if all the verses written by laureates, as laureates, were summarily burnt. But for once we feel that we are listening to a man whose whole heart, pent up by years of disappointment and suspense, has at last launched itself into a song of triumph. There is no unworthy element of petty spite or unworthy complacency to jar upon us. Whatever may be our political sympathies, we must be indifferent, not to the cause of the North, but to the cause of humanity, not to be carried away by the energy of the poetic declamation. The triumph is not offensive because it is free from meanness; and the patriotism implies a generous rejoicing that the oppressed have been freed from bondage and the poor lifted out of the dust.

He calls the *Ode* the one poetical product of the Civil War which will deserve to live by the side of the last inaugural message of the murdered President whom it eulogizes with such singular felicity.[49]

[49] In addition to the various observations regarding the *Commemoration Ode* which have been quoted herein, the following sources of critical comments may also be mentioned: *James Russell Lowell An Address* by George William Curtis, New York, 1893, p. 23; original letter in Harvard College Library from Thomas Wentworth Higginson to Lowell dated September 14, 1865, acknowledging receipt of a copy of the private edition; *The Early Years of the Saturday Club* by Edward W. Emerson, Boston, 1918, p. 400; Charles Eliot Norton in *Letters*, I, p. 267; a review of *Under the Willows and Other Poems* by J. R. Dennett in *The Nation*, December 31, 1868, VII, p. 554; *The Architecture of American Colleges* (*I. Harvard*) by Montgomery Schuyler in *The Architectural Record*, October, 1909, XXVI, p. 268.

With the passage of time the early pessimism of Lowell himself gave way to a more satisfied feeling regarding his work. In a letter to Norton from London on August 17, 1880, he wrote:

> By the way, I spent Sunday with Mr. Leveson Gower (Lord Granville's brother and a charming host), and coming in from out of doors came upon John Bright reading aloud from the "Commemoration Ode." It sounded better than I feared — but when I am asked to read I never can find anything that seems to me good enough.[50]

And again in writing to Richard Watson Gilder some years later (on January 16, 1886) he said:

> I was amazed at the praises I got. Trevelyan told me afterwards that he never could have carried through the abolition of purchase in the British Army but for the reinforcement he got from that poem.[51]

As one reads the *Commemoration Ode* now many years after that great Commemoration Day, even in the midst of the new conceptions of a new age, one can still appreciate why these early commentators and their successors through the decades could call it Lowell's greatest poem — certainly Harvard's greatest poem — the greatest poem of the Civil War — even America's greatest poem — one of the great occasional poems of the world. It could have been written only by one with the intense patriotism of Lowell — only by one who could write such a letter as he wrote to Norton on April 13, 1865, upon the advent of peace:

> The news, my dear Charles, is from Heaven. I felt a strange and tender exultation. I wanted to laugh and I wanted to cry, and ended by holding my peace and feeling devoutly thankful. There is something magnificent in having a country to love. It is almost like what one feels for a woman. Not so tender, perhaps, but to the full as self-forgetful.[52]

It could have been written only by one who not only had suffered with that white-heat patriotism through the long years of the war, but also had been bowed by the personal loss such as had

[50] *Letters*, II, p. 251.
[51] Letter to Gilder, as cited.
[52] *Letters*, I, p. 344.

come to Lowell so tragically in the death of relatives and friends.[53] It could have been written only by a true lover of humanity. Perhaps Lowell alone at that time and on that occasion could have risen to such heights; and Lowell himself had not done it before and never could do it again.

Although the *Ode* actually appeared in the *Atlantic* before Lowell's private edition was sent out, its earliest form is found in the latter book. There are innumerable differences between the two versions, practically all of which are of punctuation only; and as to such differences it is the *Atlantic* version which has been carried forward to subsequent issues. The original manuscript probably went to the printer immediately after the celebration — or at least as soon as the new sixth stanza on Lincoln had been written. When the book was well along toward completion and further type corrections were no longer possible, Lowell probably sent a printed proof to the *Atlantic* containing these numerous additional corrections. It is probable that Lowell had planned that his own edition would be the first to appear but that some delay held it up until the *Atlantic* had been published. One change made in the *Atlantic* and subsequently seems unfortunate; this is the title. The rolling, sonorous title used by Lowell for his own edition far better suits the *Ode* than the shorter form later adopted.

Following these two appearances the *Ode* is next found in the first edition of the *Harvard Memorial Biographies*, published in 1866 in two royal octavo volumes by Sever and Francis, where it appears as a prelude to the biographies with this caption: *Ode*

[53] The lives of these eight relatives are really an essential part of any story of the *Commemoration Ode*, because it was their deaths which made Lowell rise to the heights of poetic emotion in the poem. The loss of his three nephews in particular sorely affected him for many years afterward. This is seen not only in the eighth stanza of the *Ode* itself but in much of his other writing: the opening lines of the last stanza of *Memoriae Positum* written in August, 1863; three stanzas in the tenth of the second series of *Biglow Papers;* the story of the snowball battle in *A Good Word for Winter* written in 1871; and a letter written July 6, 1875, regarding the hand of reconciliation he had held out to Virginia in *Under the Old Elm* (*Letters*, II, p. 141.)

Recited at the Harvard Commemoration, July 21, 1865. By James Russell Lowell. This work was edited by Thomas Wentworth Higginson under the superintendence of a committee appointed by the Harvard Alumni Association at its meeting the preceding Commencement. A prospectus was issued October 9, 1865. There are comparatively few differences between the two versions of the *Ode* as found in the *Atlantic* and in this work.

As already noted Higginson wrote to Lowell on March 26, 1867, that in the new edition of the *Harvard Biographies*, the great poem would of course reappear; he went on to make some suggestions for a change in one of the lines. Lowell replied two days later making the change suggested and adding two other more substantial ones and then wrote:

> If your new edition is to be printed here, will you order proofs sent me? I wish it could be said somewhere that the "Ode" is reprinted "by request," or something of the kind. I told Child so before, but he said no. It strikes me in the same way now. It looks as if *I* had thrust it in there, a thought that makes me red. Why not at the head of it, after the title —"(reprinted by permission)"? I don't wish to give it too much importance, but it worries me.[54]

This second edition duly appeared in 1867 in two crown octavo volumes with the *Ode* again immediately preceding the biographies with the caption-title: *Ode Recited at the Harvard Commemoration, July 21, 1865. By James Russell Lowell.* [*Reprinted by permission.*]

The *Commemoration Ode* was first collected by Lowell in *Under the Willows and Other Poems* published by Fields, Osgood, & Co. in 1869 and first appearing about November 20, 1868. Its version therein carried further revisions, the most important of which was the addition of an entirely new stanza — the ninth. With this appearance the *Ode* took its final form with the exception of a very few minor differences. It is thereafter found in the various collected editions as they appeared. The differences in the various versions are all noted in Appendix I.

Of all the versions of the *Ode* and of all the books in which

[54] *Letters*, I, p. 379.

it appeared the privately printed edition issued by Lowell is by far the most interesting. Not only does it contain the *Ode* in its earliest known form — with words and verses most nearly approaching what Lowell actually read on that July Commemoration Day,—but it is in addition a beautiful specimen of bookmaking for the middle of the nineteenth century. The complete collation of the volume, the title-page of which has already been given, is as follows: Pages [2], [1]-25, [1]; four signatures, the first of two the others of four leaves as follows: one blank leaf; p. [1], title-page; p. [2], limitation line ["Fifty copies printed. | No. ."] and imprint [University Press: Welch, Bigelow, & Co., | Cambridge.]; p. [3], "Note. | A few passages which would have made the Poem too long in the read- | ing are added in this printed copy."; p. [4], blank; p. [5], general dedication ["To | the ever sweet and shining memory | of the | Ninety-three Sons of Harvard College | who have died for their country | in the war of nationality, | This Poem | is Dedicated."]; p. [6], blank; p. [7], special dedication ["This edition of my Commemoration Ode, printed for friends, is inscribed | to those of my own kin who have fallen, not as singling them out for selfish | praise, but because they were chiefly in my heart as I wrote. | William Lowell Putnam. James Jackson Lowell. | Charles Russell Lowell. | Warren Dutton Russell. Francis Dutton Russell. | Stephen George Perkins. | Robert Gould Shaw. Cabot Russel."(*sic*)]; p. [8], quotations:

> "Who if he be called upon to face
> Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
> Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
> Is happy as a lover, and attired
> With sudden brightness as a man inspired."
> Wordsworth.
>
> "Ἡμεῖς δὲ μεγάλοιο Διὸς πειθώμεθα βουλῇ.
> Εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης."[55]
>
> Homer, *Iliad*, XII, 241, 243.

[55] "Let it be for us to yield obedience to great Zeus's decree. There is one omen, best of all, to war for one's own land."

pp. [9]-25, text of ode; final blank page. Bound in grey boards with paper label on front cover reading "Commemoration | Ode." within a single-rule frame, turquoise green end papers, a single pasted-in fly-leaf front and back, trimmed, with top edges gilt; size 9⅝ x 6⅞ inches.

Fifty copies of this private edition were printed for friends. In an appendix to this article is found a list of as many of these recipients as it has been possible to locate. It would be interesting if the remainder could be determined. Copies must have gone to the Putnam, Lowell, Russell, Perkins, Shaw and Russel families; it has been said that each member of the Saturday Club was presented with a copy, but if so it has been impossible to learn anything of those that went to Louis Agassiz, Richard Henry Dana, Jr., John S. Dwight, John Lothrop Motley, Samuel G. Ward, Horatio Woodman, John Greenleaf Whittier, Thomas G. Appleton, John M. Forbes, James E. Cabot, Samuel G. Howe, Charles Sumner, Henry James, John A. Andrew, Martin Brimmer, James T. Fields and Samuel W. Rowse; it seems obvious that some of these at least would have received them. One would assume that Edmund Quincy, William Wetmore Story, William Page, W. J. Stillman and similar close friends had been remembered. President Thomas Hill, Professor Child, Professor E. W. Gurney, Professor George M. Lane and other college associates should have received copies. Perhaps E. L. Godkin and W. L. Garrison should be on the list. It should be noted that the names of thirty recipients have been located; the possible recipients listed above number thirty-three so that at least thirteen could not have been included.

Such is the factual story of Harvard's proudest poetic achievement — its monument to the devotion of those sons who answered the call in that Civil War crisis — a monument which will be more enduring than the bricks of Memorial Hall,— and a monument which is "still beaconing from the heights of undegenerate years" in the ordeal of 1943.

Appendix I

Variations in the Different Printings of the Commemoration Ode

(Based on the version in the Standard Library edition of Lowell's collected works.)

The title used by Lowell for the Private Edition was: *Ode Recited at the Commemoration of The Living and Dead Soldiers of Harvard University, July 21, 1865.* Elsewhere it was: *Ode recited at the Harvard Commemoration, July 21, 1865.*

The alignment of the lines throughout the *Ode* varies to some extent in the several versions.

There are approximately forty instances where the punctuation as first used in the Private Edition was subsequently changed. Such differences are not indicated below; nor are several other cases involving punctuation changes only.

Stanza II.

Line 1: In the Private Edition and both editions of the *Memorial Biographies* the reading is . . . *welcomes home* instead of . . . *welcomes back.*

Stanza IV.

Lines 23-25: These three lines —

But stay! no age was e'er degenerate,
Unless men held it at too cheap a rate,
For in our likeness still we shape our fate.

did not appear in the *Atlantic* nor the Private Edition; in both editions of the *Memorial Biographies* the last line reads: *For in our image still is shaped our fate:.* The three lines as they appear in the *Memorial Biographies* were inserted in Lowell's own hand in the copy of the Private Edition which he presented to Charles Eliot Norton.

Line 32: Prior to final collected edition *doth leaven* is used instead of *can leaven.*

Line 33: The final collected edition as well as the Private Edition reads *Our earthy dulness;* elsewhere *earthly* is used.

Line 42: Prior to the final collected edition *glimmering* is used instead of *beaconing.*

Stanza V.

Line 13: In the Private Edition, *Atlantic* and first edition of the *Memorial Biographies* the line reads *Lights the black lips of cannon, and the sword;* in *Under the Willows* and the final edition the first word is *Light;* in the second

edition of the *Memorial Biographies* the line reads *Reddens the cannon's lips, and while the sword.*

To Thomas Wentworth Higginson's letter of March 26, 1867, in criticism of this line (see page 184 infra) Lowell replied on March 28 (see *Letters*, I, p. 379) as follows: "Your criticism is perfectly just, and I am much obliged to you for it — though I might defend myself, I believe, by some constructions even looser in some of the Greek choruses. But, on the whole, where I have my choice I prefer to make sense. . . . There is a horrible truth in the *litera scripta manet*, and the confounded things make mouths at us when we try to alter, but I think *this* may do:

'Ere yet the sharp decisive word
Redden the cannon's lips, and while the sword.' "

So the line appeared in Higginson's new edition (except that the first word was changed to the indicative.) But it will also be noted that Lowell subsequently restored the original line — except for the mood.

Line 19: In the Private Edition the line reads *Long blown on, flames;* instead of *Bursts up in flame;*.

Line 33: In all versions prior to *Under the Willows* this line reads *So generous is Fate;* instead of *So bountiful is Fate;*.

Stanza VI.

This stanza was not in the *Ode* as originally recited, but added immediately after; it appears in all printed versions.

Line 12: Prior to *Under the Willows*, *mould* appears instead of *moulds*.

Lines 29-34: The six lines —

His was no lonely mountain-peak of mind,
Thrusting to thin air o'er our cloudy bars,
A sea-mark now, now lost in vapors blind;
Broad prairie rather, genial, level-lined,
Fruitful and friendly for all human kind,
Yet also nigh to heaven and loved of loftiest stars.

did not appear in the Private Edition nor the *Atlantic;* in both editions of the *Memorial Biographies* they were placed later immediately after the line *And one of Plutarch's men talked with us face to face*, with the last two of the six reading

Fruitful and friendly for his humankind,
Yet also known to Heaven and friend with all its stars.

In the Private Edition presented to Charles Eliot Norton, Lowell wrote in his own hand a still different version of the additional lines to be inserted after *And one of Plutarch's men . . . :*

His was no lonely mountain-peak of mind
Thrusting to thin air through our cloudy bars,
A sea-mark now, now veiled in vapors blind;
Broad prairie rather, genial, level-lined
With the unlaurelled ploughshare's scars,
Fruitful & friendly for all humankind,
friend with
Yet also known to Heaven & ~~all its~~ stars:

Line 39: This line — *And thwart her genial will;* — first appears in the final version.

Stanza VII.

Line 18: Prior to *Under the Willows* the last word is *enwreathe* instead of *inwreathe.*

Line 20: Prior to *Under the Willows* this line reads *When other crowns are cold and soon grow sere.* instead of *When other crowns grow, while we twine them, sear.*

Stanza VIII.

Line 24: Lowell ended his aforementioned letter to Higginson of March 28, 1867, (see page 196 infra) as follows:

"Item, in the eighth please make this change:

'Virtue treads paths that end not in the grave,
But through those constellations go
That shed celestial influence on the brave.
If life were but to draw this dusty breath
That doth our wits enslave,
And with the crowd to hurry to and fro,
Seeking we know not what, and finding death,
These did unwisely; but if living be,
As some are born to know,
The power to ennoble, and inspire
In other souls our brave desire
For fruit, not leaves, of Time's immortal tree,
These truly live, our thought's essential fire,
And to the saner,' etc.

There! I won't open the book again, or I shall write you another ode instead of mending this. But in this latter passage the metre wanted limbering a little — it was *built* too much with blank-verse bricks — and I think I have bettered it, at least to the ear."

These additional lines were not included by Higginson. The latter subsequently wrote to Charles Eliot Norton (*Letters*, I, p. 379, note): "Apparently I begged off from them, or perhaps they were just too late. Some years afterward Lowell wrote me a letter (now lost) saying that he had kept no copy, and wished to use them. Apparently they could not be found. One of the emendations he seems to have remembered and used." As a matter of fact Higginson did find Lowell's early letter at a later date and sent him a copy of it on June 29, 1875.

It seems probable that Higginson did actually beg off from the new lines because Lowell wrote again a few days later (*Letters*, I, p. 382): "Any change in what the ear has grown wonted to is at first unpleasing; but you shall do as you like with *your* copy of the 'Ode,' and of mine *farò altro governo* if, when I reprint it in a volume, I am as discontent with that passage as now. But print yours as it is and I shall be satisfied."

Line 25: Prior to the final collected edition the line reads *No ban of endless night* . . . instead of *No bar of endless night* . . . .

Stanza IX.

This stanza was not read on Commemoration Day; it was written at a much later date, first appearing in *Under The Willows*.

Stanza X.

Line 5: Prior to *Under the Willows* the line reads *Dreams are those names* . . . instead of *Dumb are those names* . . .

Lines 6-7: In all versions prior to *Under the Willows* these two lines read

Forceless as is the shadow of a cloud,
They live but in the ear:

instead of

Dream-footed as the shadow of a cloud,
They flit across the ear:

Stanza XI.

Line 23: This line — *For her time of need, and then* — does not appear in the Private Edition nor the *Atlantic;* in both editions of the *Memorial Biographies* the line reads *For her day* . . . . In the Private Edition presented to Norton, Lowell inserted in his hand *For her day of need & then* as in the latter.

Line 35: In the *Atlantic* the line reads *Banners, advance with triumph*, . . . instead of *adance.*

Lines 47-52: Between the lines *With room about her hearth for all mankind!* and *No challenge sends she to the elder world*, the various versions read as follows:

Private Edition —

The helm from her bold front she doth unbind,
Sends all her handmaid armies back to spin,
And, their heaped war-clouds furled,
Bids her grim navies hold their thunders in:

Atlantic —

The helm from her bold front she doth unbind,
Sends all her handmaid armies back to spin,
And bids her navies hold their thunders in:

First Edition of the *Memorial Biographies* —

The helm from her bold front she may unbind,
Send all her handmaid armies back to spin,
And bid her navies hold their thunders in:

Second Edition of the *Memorial Biographies* —

The helm from her bold front she may unbind,
Send all her handmaid armies back to spin,
And bids her navies, that so lately hurled
Their crashing battle, hold their thunders in:

Under the Willows (and subsequently) —

The fire is dreadful in her eyes no more;
From her bold front the helm she doth unbind,
Sends all her handmaid armies back to spin,
And bids her navies, that so lately hurled
Their crashing battle, hold their thunders in,
Swimming like birds of calm along the unharmful shore.

This was another change which Lowell suggested in his letter to Higginson of March 28, 1867: "On looking further I find to my intense disgust a verse without a mate in the last stanza but one, and I must put in a patch. If I had only kept my manuscript! We must read,

And bid her navies, that so lately hurled
Their crashing battle, hold their thunders in,

or else the poor *world* just below will have no law of gravitation to hold itself up by. I know I had something better originally, but I can't get it back." The "something better" can here be seen, but Lowell evidently did not have a copy of his own Private Edition to which he himself could turn.

Line 55: Prior to *Under the Willows* this line reads *Plays on . . .* instead of *Plays o'er her mouth . . . .*

Stanza XII.

Lines 6-7: The two lines

No poorest in thy borders but may now
Lift to the juster skies a man's enfranchised brow.

first appear in *Under the Willows.*

Appendix II

List of Known Recipients of the Privately Printed Edition of Lowell's Commemoration Ode

Number	*Recipient*	*Present Owner*	*Remarks*
2	(Name erased)	Unknown	Formerly owned by Will Lambert and by Henry E. H ton.
3	Charles Eliot Norton ("Charles E. Norton")	Harvard College Library	Presented by an anonymou who bought it through Ed Wells & Co. at the auction ton's books on May 2, 1923.
4	Josephine Shaw Lowell ("Effie")	Harvard College Library	Received in the bequest of An ell who bought it May 4, the auction of books of Carlo sell Lowell, daughter of the r
5	George William Curtis ("G. W. Curtis")	Parkman D. Howe	Receipt acknowledged by C September 12, 1865.
7	Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar	Sherman Hoar Bowles (a grandson of Judge Hoar)	Receipt acknowledged by H September 10, 1865.
10	Henry Wadsworth Longfellow ("H. W. L.")	Craigie House, Cambridge	
12	Henry Warren Torrey ("H. W. Torrey")	The Pierpont Morgan Library	Bears bookplate of D. F. A
13	James Walker ("Rev^{d}. D^{r}. Walker")	Harvard College Library	Rebound; received in F Walker's bequest March 22,
16	Thomas Wentworth Higginson ("T. W. H.")	New York Public Library	Receipt acknowledged by son on September 14, 1865; ly owned by Stephen H. W and by Owen D. Young; by the Library in the gift Young and Albert A. Berg.
18	Charles William Storey ("C. W. S.")	Charles M. Storey (grandson of recipient)	
19	Estes Howe ("E. H.")	Lois L. Howe (daughter of recipient)	
20	Frederic Henry Hedge ("F. H. Hedge, D.D.")	Josiah K. Lilly, Jr.	Sold at the auction of the re books on March 19, 1919; time owned by John A. Spoo
22	Charles Frederick Briggs ("C. F. B.")	The Rosenbach Company	
25	Edwin Percy Whipple ("E. P. Whipple")	Yale University Library	Sold at the auction of W books on April 7, 1903; at owned by Owen F. Aldis and ed in the gift of his books

r	*Recipient*	*Present Owner*	*Remarks*
	Richard Grant White ("Richard Grant White, Esq.")	Chapin Library, Williams College	Receipt acknowledged by White on September 21, 1865; sold at the auction of his books in October, 1870; formerly owned by Jacob C. Chamberlain and by Walter T. Wallace.
	Marcia Dunlap ("Miss Marcia Dunlap")	James F. Drake, Inc.	Sold at the auction of her books on May 25, 1933.
	Sophia J. Townsend ("Miss Sophia J. Townsend")	Estate of Frank B. Bemis	Formerly owned by C. E. Pyser and by Frank Maier.
	Francis Henry Underwood	Unknown	At one time owned by William H. Arnold.
	(Name erased)	Unknown	Formerly owned by Edwin B. Holden and perhaps by Herschel V. Jones.
	Jeremiah Lewis Diman ("Professor J. L. Diman")	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh	Bought for the account of Hugh F. B. Sharp at the auction of the books of Miss Louise Diman on May 24, 1932, and bequeathed by him to the National Library.
	Robert Carter	T. E. Hanley	
	Edward Everett Hale ("E. E. Hale")	Brown University Library	Receipt acknowledged by Hale on October 4, 1865; sold at the auction of some of his books on March 17, 1910, to Charles W. McClellan whose collection was later presented to Brown by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.
	Thomas Hughes ("Thomas Hughes, M-P")	New York Public Library	Formerly owned by Frederick W. Lehmann and by W. T. H. Howe; received by the Library in the gift of Albert A. Berg.
	Oliver Wendell Holmes ("O. W. H.")	Edward Jackson Holmes (the Autocrat's grandson)	
	John Holmes ("J. H.")	Carroll A. Wilson	
	John Bartlett ("Mr. Bartlett")	Henry E. Huntington Library	Formerly owned by Frederick W. French, by William H. Buckler, by Brayton Ives, and by Judd Stewart.
	Marshall T. Bigelow ("Mr. Bigelow")	Unknown	Formerly owned by George M. Williamson, by Wm. H. Lambert, and by William Bunker; this "Mr. Bigelow" may have been John Bigelow, editor of the *New York Evening Post*, instead of M. T. Bigelow of Welch, Bigelow & Co., printers of the *Ode*.
	Ralph Waldo Emerson	Unknown	Receipt acknowledged by Emerson on September 17, 1865.
	Sydney Howard Gay	Unknown	Receipt acknowledged by Gay on September 16, 1865.

Number	*Recipient*	*Present Owner*	*Remarks*
?	Benjamin Peirce	Unknown	The recipient's grandson, Be Peirce Ellis, states that this co presented to the Public Libr the City of Boston about 19 cannot now be located.
?	John Weiss	Unknown	Receipt acknowledged by W October 11, 1865.
?	Gideon Nye	Unknown	Inclusion is based on the foll inscription in a copy of Nye's *Papers upon the "Alabama Kindred Questions,* Hon 1869: "To James Russell L LL.D. with Mr. Nye's Compl in gratitude for the Commem Ode."
None	None	Lockwood Memorial Library, University of Buffalo	Evidently an extra, unnur copy; trimmed and bound others, however.
None	None	Hamilton Vaughan Bail	Perhaps the printer's copy; nally without binding, now morocco; the only large, unc untrimmed copy.

Some Textual Peculiarities of the First English *Don Quixote*

By Edwin B. Knowles, Jr.

THOMAS SHELTON'S lively but slipshod translation of Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, Part I, London, 1612, is a fascinating example of the vagaries of seventeenth-century printing. The work was done in the shop of William Stansby, a well-known printer in the early 1600's, for the bookseller William Barret and the publisher Edward Blount. The latter will be remembered for his connection with the Shakespeare first folio, Mabbe's *Rogue*, Florio's *Montaigne*, and other important works. Both he and Stansby were reputable men. Despite that fact, a comparison of the texts of seventeen 1612 *Don Quixotes* reveals an amazing number of faults—the result of printing practices common to the London presses of Stansby's generation.

The book which first presented the immortal Don and his Sancho to Englishmen in their own tongue has been known to dealers in rare books for only fifty-one years—since the description by Bernard Quaritch in his catalogue Number 124, 1892. However, confusion has existed in bibliographies and library catalogues down to the last few years. This situation resulted from the common assumption that *only* Part II was printed by Blount in 1620, and hence that the sets of Parts I and II contained the 1612 Part I and the 1620 Part II. Actually both parts were printed in 1620, Part I in a second edition to match Part II. The confusion was made easy both because the 1620 Part I was

undated and because the 1612 Part I was excessively rare. Actually, the two Parts I are not at all similar.[1]

The present article is the by-product of a census, as yet unfinished, of the 1612 edition. Although a majority of the twenty-odd known copies are in the United States, they are widely scattered. Through the happy circumstance that Mr. Leonard Kebler possessed two of these first editions it was possible to establish a basis for this study by collating his copies. Fortunately, also, they happen to represent extremes in the number of variants found—that is, in relative "correctness."

From the collation of the Kebler Parts I a list of seventy-odd variants was assembled.[2] Fifteen other copies were then checked against this list.[3] It is obvious that such a method could not achieve a definitive text. For a book the length of *Don Quixote* the labor and expense of arriving at such a text would hardly be justified. This article, therefore, presents the results of a comparison which, though it covers seventeen copies, covers them for a set list of variants; it does not pretend to account for all the peculiarities to be found in each one.

The first English version of Cervantes's masterpiece was a small quarto measuring approximately 7⅛ by 5½ inches. Copies vary as much as ½ inch in both dimensions as a result of trimming

[1] See the author's *The First and Second Editions of Shelton's Don Quixote Part I: A Collation and Dating*. In: *Hispanic Review*, Vol. IX, No. 2, April, 1941. As there stated, the definite settlement of the 1620 date for the second edition of Part I was in large measure due to a shrewd discovery of the late E. Gordon Duff.

[2] *Variant* is arbitrarily used to describe a variety of phenomena: pagination, spelling, changes in phrasing, omissions, etc.

[3] All of the copies in the United States were personally inspected, except that at the Huntington Library, which Mr. C. K. Edmonds kindly checked for me. For the privilege of examining copies I am indebted to Messrs. Leonard Kebler, Carl T. Keller, Barton Currie, Frank J. Hogan, A. S. W. Rosenbach, Gabriel Wells, Clarence S. Brigham, Arthur Swann, and the late A. Edward Newton; also to the Library of Congress, the Pierpont Morgan Library, the New York Public Library (Berg Collection). Not all the known foreign copies could be examined for me, for a variety of reasons. Those mentioned herein were read for me by Messrs. A. F. Scholfield of Cambridge, R. H. Hill of Oxford, J. V. Scholderer of the British Museum, and Senor Jordi Rubió, sometime of the Biblioteca de Catalunya—to all of whom, my sincere thanks. This study took off from a partial collation begun by Mr. Kebler several years ago, the notes from which he placed at my disposal.

and rebinding. Generally speaking, the older the binding, the "squarer" the copy. The bindings themselves also vary greatly—from the "original vellum"[4] of the Currie copy and the "original calf"[4] of the Rosenbach copy to the two-volumes-in-one, in old calf, of the Library of Congress copy, and the handsome red morocco by Rivière of the Morgan, Huntington, and Hogan copies.

Collation: ¶⁴, A-Z, Aa-Oo⁸, [Pp]²; 302 leaves.

Description: Leaf 1-r Title; 1-v blank; 2-rv Dedication; 3-r–7-r To The Reader; 7-v–9-v Certain Sonnets; 10-r–12-v Table Of Contents; 13-r–300-v [paged 1-594] Text; 301-r–302-v Verses.

The title-page is a printed one, boxed with single rules at the top and bottom and double rules at the sides.

> THE | HISTORY | OF | The VALOROVS | AND WITTIE | Knight-Errant, | Don-Qvixote | Of the *Mancha.* | *Translated out of the Spanish.* | — | [Ornament] | — | *LONDON* | Printed by *William Stansby*, for *Ed. Blount* and | *W. Barret* 1612. |

The pages of the text are also enclosed in the ruled lines so common in English books of this period. At the top of each page are double lines about 5/16 of an inch apart, with the running-title, "The delightfull Historie of the Part. 1. [2, 3, 4]" on the verso, and "Part. 1. [2, 3, 4] wittie Knight Don-Quixote." on the recto. At the outside of each page is a margin enclosed between rules about 7/8 of an inch apart. The page number appears in the small corner box formed by the crossing of the two margin and the two top lines. Judging by the many instances of shifting or lost type in the running-titles and page numbers, this use of double rules at the top and margin edges of each page made it difficult to lock the frames securely. However, this trouble does not appear to have affected the text page proper. The latter measures about 6 by 3¼ inches but may vary as much as 1/8 of an inch

[4] *The Carl H. Pforzheimer Library*, 1940, Vol. I, p. 140.

THE HISTORY OF THE VALOROVS AND WITTIE KNIGHT-ERRANT, DON-QVIXOTE

Of the *Mancha.*

Tranſlated out of the Spaniſh.

LONDON

Printed by *William Stansby.* for *Ed. Blount* and *W. Barret* 1612.

Printed with the permission of the Pierpont Morgan Library.

in any or all dimensions. For the most part the type is clear and but slightly crowded.

For convenience of presentation, the variants have been divided into three groups: (1) those which were never corrected; (2) those which have been corrected in some copies; and (3) a few examples of shifting type where several forms occur.

The following printer's errors appear in all the copies seen:[5]

[D7]-v, p. 46 is misnumbered 64
[D8]-r, p. 47 is misnumbered 65
[F7]-v, p. 78 is misnumbered 77
[F8]-r, p. 79 is misnumbered 78
I-v, p. 114, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
I2-r, p. 115, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
I3-r, p. 117, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
I3-v, p. 118, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
I4-r, p. 119, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
I4-v, p. 120, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I5]-r, p. 121, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I5]-v, p. 122, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I6]-r, p. 123, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I6]-v, p.124, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I7]-v, p. 126, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[I8]-r, p. 127, Part. 2. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
[S7]-r, p. 269, is misnumbered 273
T-r, p. 273, Part. 4. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
T3-r, p. 277, Part. 4. instead of Part. 3. in running-title
V4-v, p. 296, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[V5]-v, p. 298, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[V6]-r, p. 299, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[V7]-r, p. 301, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[V8]-v, p. 304, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
X3-v, p. 310, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
X4-r, p. 311, Part. 3. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
Z-r, p. 337 is misnumbered 335. (Two pages are lost here in the numbering. [Y8]-r and Z-r are both numbered 335, and [Y8]-v and Z-v are both 336.)

[5] The copies used in this study are: 1. Kebler No. 1, 2. Newton, 3. Cambridge University, 4. Rosenbach (personal copy), 5. Barcelona, 6. Keller, 7. British Museum, 8. Oxford University, 9. Wells, 10. Currie, 11. Morgan, 12. New York Public Library (Berg Collection), 13. Bemis, 14. Huntington Library, 15. Library of Congress, 16. Hogan, 17. Kebler No. 2. The numbering of copies is dictated by the table on page 211.

[Cc6]-r, p. 393, Cart. 4. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[Cc7]-r, p. 395, Cart. 4. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[Dd7]-r, p. 411, Cart. 4. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
[Dd7]-v, p. 412 is misnumbered 413
[Dd8]-r, p. 413 is misnumbered 412
[Ee6]-v, p. 426 is misnumbered 446
Ff-r, p. 431 is misnumbered 451
Ff-v, p. 432 is misnumbered 468
Ff2-r, p. 433 is misnumbered 469
Ff2-v, p. 434 is misnumbered 454. (Twenty pages are added in the numbering, Ff3-r being 455, and so on.)
Gg-v, p. 468, Part. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
Hh2-v, p. 486, Part. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
Hh3-v, p. 488, Part, instead of Part. 4. in running-title
Ii-v, p. 500, Part. instead of Part. 4. in running-title
Oo-r, p. 579 is misnumbered 597
Pp-rv and [Pp2]-rv, pages [595], [596], [597], [598] are unnumbered.

The next, and most interesting, group of variants contains those which exist in two states—uncorrected and corrected. In order to establish definitely which is the later word, the parallel phrasing is given from the second English edition (1620) and also from the original Spanish.[6] Each item dealing with wording in the following list has, therefore, four parts: the uncorrected state, the corrected state, the 1620 (second edition) state, and the original Spanish.[7]

1. A4-r, sonnet "Don Belianis," line 10:
"ceasd on occasions top" to "seasd"
1620, A4-r: "seyzd." Spanish, **-v: "traxo"

[6] Thomas Shelton translated from *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quixote De La Mancha*, printed in Brussels by Roger Velpius in 1607. First pointed out by A. J. Duffield in the introduction, p. xlii, of his own translation (London, 1881). Fitzmaurice-Kelly gives a more thorough statement in his introduction, pp. xxxi ff., to the Tudor Translations edition of *Don Quixote*, London, 1896. There is a copy of the Brussels edition in the Library of the Hispanic Society, New York City.

[7] The Spanish on occasion shows only that Shelton has a cavalier disregard for accuracy. See Nos. 5 and 13. No. 15 is not influenced by *tañendo;* common sense suggests that one can trip through the fields better playing an instrument the size of a viola than he could with one as large as a cello. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14 are better translations in the second form.

2. A4-v, sonnet "Orlando Furioso," line 2:
"Who might among" to "mightst"
1620, A4-v: "might'st." Spanish, **3-r: "pudieras"
3. Same sonnet, line 8:
"as passe obliuious wretch" to "obliuions reach"
1620, A4-v: "obliuions reach." Spanish, **3-r: "respetò el olvido"
4. Same sonnet, line 11:
"I left . . . my wit" to "lost . . . my wit"
1620, A4-v: "lost." Spanish, **3-r: "yo perdiste el seso"
5. Same sonnet, line 13:
"schite that crowne" to "Schite"
1620, A4-v: "Schite." Spanish, **3-r: "Cita fiero domas"
["Schite" from "Cita," meaning Scythian, is an amusing instance of Shelton's characteristic tendency to use an English homonym for Spanish words.]
6. Same sonnet, line 14:
"being fit" to "louing fit"
1620, A4-v: "louing fit." Spanish, **3-r: "en amor"
7. A4-v, sonnet "Solis Dan," line 3:
"Yet now thine acts" to "yet none"
1620, A4-v: "yet none." Spanish, **3-v: "nunca"
8. Same sonnet, line 4:
"thy proceedings, taxe" to "proceedings taxe" [no comma]
1620, A4-v: no comma. Spanish: not relevant.
9. Same sonnet, line 7:
"with blows . . . y-shlut" to "y-shent"
1620, A4-v: "y-shent." Spanish, **3-v: "apaleado"
10. [A5]-r, sonnet "Princess Oriana," line 11:
"From that well mannered Knight" to "thy"
1620, [A5]-r: "thy." Spanish, **2-r: "Del comedido hidalgo"
11. Same sonnet, line 12:
"Id'e en'uy now once hap" to "enuy now ones hap"
1620, [A5]-r: "enuy now ones." Spanish, **2-r: "Que assi embidiada fuera"
12. [A5]-r, sonnet "Gandaline," line 1:
"famou's" to "famous"
1620, [A5]-r: "famous." Spanish, **2-r: "famoso"
13. Same sonnet, line 4:
"Or thou . . . wist" to "Er thou . . . wist"
1620, [A5]-r: "Ere." Spanish, **2-r: "Que lo passaste"
14. [A8]-r, "The Contents, Part IV, Chapter X":
"with to her" to "with other"
1620, [A8]-r: "with other." Spanish, [Pp4]-r: "con otras"

15. [D6]-r, page 43, line 14:
"playing on a high Croude" to "playing on a Croude"
1620, [D5]-r, p. 41: "on a Crowd." Spanish, [C5]-r, p. 41: "cantando y tañendo"
16. G4-r, page 87, line 31:
"ouer·greene" [a half hyphen] to "ouer greene"
1620, G3-r, p. 85: "ouer-greene." Spanish not relevant.
[Though not a case of correction, the two forms fit into the general pattern as the following table will show.]
17. [L5]-v, page 154, line 3 of the title of Chapter V:
"dead" to "|dead"
1620 and Spanish not relevant. [Like No. 16 this does not involve a correction. Early in the printing what may have been a piece of metal, probably used for spacing, became stuck in front of "dead" and remained there.]
18. P-v, page 210 is misnumbered 214 in some copies
19. P2-r, page 211 is misnumbered 215 in some copies
20. Q3-v, page 230 is misnumbered 234 in some copies
21. [Q5]-v, page 234 is misnumbered 238 in some copies
22. [R7]-v, page 254 is misnumbered 244 in some copies
23. [R8]-r, page 255 is misnumbered 245 in some copies
24. X-v, page 306, Part. 3. for Part. 4. in some copies
25. [Aa7]-r, p. 363, the stem of the *P* in Part. 4. is lacking in some copies; only the loop is found [ᵓ].
26. Bb4-r, page 373, the *P* of Part. 4. is partially or entirely lacking in some copies.
27. Dd3-v, page 404, line 29:
"noble discents" to "noble descents"
1620, Dd-v, p. 402: "descents." Spanish, [Cc6]-v, p. 412, "illustres decendencias"
28. [Ee5]-v, page 424. Most copies have no page number; a few have the final *4*.
29. Ii-v, page 500 is misnumbered 450 in some copies
30. Ii2-r, page 501 is misnumbered 451 in some copies
31. Ii3-v, page 504 is misnumbered 4.98 in some copies
32. Ii4-r, page 505 is misnumbered 499 in some copies
33. [Ii5]-v, page 508 is misnumbered 502 in some copies
34. [Ii6]-r, page 509 is misnumbered 503 in some copies

In the following table the variants just listed are indicated by their numbers with the signatures at the right margin. *x* indicates the uncorrected form and *c* the corrected. For Nos. 16, 17, 25, 26, and 28 *x* indicates the form in Kebler No. 1 and *c* the form in Kebler No. 2. The copies are named at the bottom of the table.

	Kebler No. 1	Newton	Cambridge	Rosenbach	Barcelona	Keller	British Mus.	Oxford	Wells	Currie	Morgan	N. Y. Public	Bemis	Huntington	Congressional	Hogan	Kebler No. 2	
1.	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-r
2.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
3.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
4.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
5.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
6.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
7.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
8.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
9.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	A4-v
10.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[A5]-r
11.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[A5]-r
12.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[A5]-r
13.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[A5]-r
14.	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	[A8]-r
15.	x	c	x	c	c	c	c	x	x	x	c	c	c	x	c	c	c	[D6]-r
16.	x	c	x	x	c	x	x	c	c	x	c	c	c	c	c	x	c	G4-r
17.	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	c	c	c	[L5]-v
18.	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	P-v
19.	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	P2-r
20.	c	x	c	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	Q3-v
21.	c	x	c	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[Q5]-v]8
22.	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	c	c	c	[R7]-v
23.	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	c	c	c	[R8]-r
24.	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	x	c	x	c	x	c	x	c	X-v
25.	x	c	x	c	x	c	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	[Aa7]-r
26.	x	c	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	Bb4-r
27.	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	Dd3-v
28.	x	x	c	x	x	x	c	x	x	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	[Ee5]-v
29.	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	Ii-v
30.	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	x	x	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	Ii2-r
31.	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	Ii3-v
32.	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	Ii4-r
33.	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	[Ii5]-v
34.	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	x	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c	[Ii6]-r

[8] Variants Nos. 20 and 21 had been found only in the Newton copy when I wrote the statement for *The A. Edward Newton Collection*, A-D, p. 146 (1941). Dr. Rosenbach's copy also contains them.

The first thirteen corrections are all in Signature A. From the grouping of the seven *x*'s and ten *c*'s in solid blocks it is evident that they were made at the same time. For this signature, then, there exist two states, in spite of the fact that two copies have the *c* form for No. 1 where the others do not. A similar situation exists for variants 31, 32, 33, and 34, all from Signature Ii. The breakdown here is twelve *x*'s and five *c*'s, indicating that the corrections were made at a later time than for Signature A.

The remaining variants are examples of mixed signatures, but in a number of instances (Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 29) they confirm the general drift in degree of correctness from Kebler No. 1 to Kebler No. 2. The *apparently* unique variants, Nos. 22 and 23 for the Huntington copy, result from the accident of survival and the fact that all seventeen copies could not be collated with each other (see Note 8, *ante*). If that could have been done, more errors peculiar to one copy might well have come to light. For example, so far as is known the Morgan Library copy is the only one to lack a page number on page 280, Sig. T4-v. To conclude: as they have been arranged, these seventeen copies exhibit a first and second state for Signatures A and Ii, and a general—though disconnected and sporadic—progression towards a more correct form.

The third form of variant, where as a result of sliding or dropped type there are more than two forms, is difficult to present in brief compass because symbols cannot be used. For that reason only three examples will be given.

1. The word *vanq'uisht* in line 4 of the "Orlando" sonnet, A4-v, appears to have started off intact, but something dropped out of the line, perhaps a spacer, and after that a blank space occurs in various positions. (In this and the next two examples, the order of variants follows that of the preceding table. A single hyphen indicates a space in the original, and a double hyphen a double space.) 1. vanq'uisht, 2. vanq'uisht, 3. vanq'-uisht, 4. vanq'uisht, 5. vanq'-uisht, 6. vanq'uisht, 7. vanq'uisht, 8.

va-nq'uisht, 9. vanq'-uisht, 10. va-nq'uisht, 11. va-nq'uisht, 12. va-nq'-uisht, 13. va.nq'uisht, 14. va-nq'uisht, 15. va-nq'uisht, 16. va-nq'uisht, 17. van-q'uisht.

2. The *P* of *PART. 4.* on page 465, [Ff-8]-r, must have dropped out very early in the run. As a result we find different forms of *ART.* 1. \-RT, 2. -ART, 3. --RT, 4. A-RT, 5. -ART, 6. -ART, 7. A-RT, 8. -ART, 9. A-RT, 10. A-RT, 11. A-RT, 12. A-RT, 13. \-RT, 14. \-RT, 15. A-RT, 16. A-RT, 17. \-RT.

3. On page 559, [Mm7]-r, there appears a similar sequence of faulty *PART*'s. 1. \-RT, 2. --RT, 3. --RT, 4. --RT, 5. -ART, 6. -ART, 7.- \RT, 8. -ART, 9. A-RT, 10. \-RT, 11. A-RT, 12. A-RT, 13. A-RT, 14. -ART, 15. -ART, 16. --RT, 17. --RT.

More faulty running-titles and page numbers could be listed. As has been suggested earlier, the double rules at the tops and margin edges of the pages must have presented a real problem in fastening the type securely. The periods in *PART. 4.* appear and disappear from copy to copy. However, the only instance of sliding type found in the text page itself was *vanq'uisht.* The permutations of that word loosely conform to the general pattern of change from *x* to *c* already illustrated, but the same does not hold true for the two examples of varying *PART*'s.

Tables of symbols make for dull reading; however, the array of *x*'s and *c*'s set down here tells a graphic story about the methods of proof-reading and assembling of books—at least for one book —in the year 1612. It must be remembered, naturally, that chance has dictated the survival of these seventeen copies for 331 years.

It is patent that no conscientious job of proof-reading was ever done. Shelton himself may have looked over Signature A and changed some of the phrasing of the sonnets, for in general the end result is a better translation. But his handiwork cannot be definitely ascertained, and if we take his dedication to the Lord of Walden literally, the chances are against his being the cor-

rector. After making the not-uncommon explanation that he had done the translation hurriedly for "a very dear friend" and then tossed it into a corner, he continues:

> . . . at the intreaty of others my friends, I was content to let it come to light, conditionally, that some one or other, would peruse and amend the errors escaped; my many affairs hindering me from undertaking that labour. Now I understand by the Printer, that the copy was presented to your Honour: which did at the first, somewhat disgust me. . . .

The number of "errors escaped" which continue on into the second edition as glaringly bad translations is legion.

The largest number of corrections was in pagination. However, if we remember the examples of misnumbering listed first in this study as never corrected, we may conclude that it was largely a matter of luck that some wrong figures caught the speeding eye of the printer. In most copies fewer than half the mistakes in figures were ever changed. And even when corrected, a sheet might as likely as not be lifted off the drying line and folded into a gathering of unchanged sheets.

All these phenomena lend further corroboration to statements long since made by McKerrow, Greg, and others as to the inaccuracies of early seventeenth-century printing. In the case of the *Don Quixote* which William Stansby printed in his shop for Blount and Barret to sell to the romance-reading public of London, the result is a book, any copy of which is unique in some small respect, and any copy of which is a happy hunting ground for the bibliographer.

Two New Manuscript Items for a George Sandys Bibliography

By Richard Beale Davis

GEORGE SANDYS, "*poetarum Anglorum sui saeculi facili princeps,*"[1] according to the later seventeenth century, owed his reputation primarily to his work as translator and paraphraser. His version of Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* composed in part in Virginia,[2] was admired as a model of the translator's art by Sandys's contemporaries[3] and by Dryden[4] and Pope.[5] His *Paraphrase upon the Divine Poems,*[6] widely praised by laity and clergy, was a favorite with Charles I. And his translation of Hugo Grotius's *Christ's Passion*[7] is said to have pleased greatly even the author of the original.

Though both translations and paraphrases were conceived in the spirit of true poetry, very little original verse by Sandys remains extant. This little was widely scattered. Sandys included his rather well-known *Hymn to the Redeemer*[8] and a few classical

[1] Entered in the church register at Boxley in Kent where Sandys was buried (cf. Richard Hooper. *The Poetical Works of George Sandys,* 2 vols., London, 1872, I, p. xlviii). Compare this with his reputation discussed in note 4, below.

[2] Cf. R. B. Davis. *The Early Editions of George Sandys's Ovid: The Circumstances of Production,* in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America,* XXXV, 4th quarter 1941, pp. 255-276.

[3] Cf. commendatory poems on Sandys's work in Hooper, vols. 1 and 2.

[4] Dryden called Sandys "the best versifier of the former age," etc. (cf. "Preface Prefixed to the Fables," *Works of John Dryden,* ed. by George Saintsbury, Edinburgh, 1885, XI, p. 209).

[5] Cf. Armistead C. Gordon, Jr. *George Sandys,* in *D. A. B.*

[6] London, 1638 (colophon 1637). *A Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David* had appeared in 1636.

[7] London, 1640, John Legatt.

[8] Also called *Prayer at the Holy Sepulchre.* Cf. *A Relation,* 6th edition, London, 1670, p. 130.

adaptations in his first published work, *A Relation of a Journey Begun . . . Anno Domini 1610 . . .*,[9] his account of his journey to the Holy Land. At the end of the *Paraphrases* he published the *Deo Opt. Max.*, his hymn of thanksgiving to his God because —

> Then [thou] brought'st me home in safety, that this earth
> Might bury me, which fed me from my birth . . .

Besides these two, there are only[10] his dedicatory verses to the members of the royal family. Sandys appears to have been a lifelong friend of Charles I. When Sandys returned from his Mediterranean travels in 1615 and published his *Relation*, he dedicated it to Charles as prince. When the poet returned from his treasurership of the Virginia colony in 1626, he became a gentleman of the privy chamber to the new king Charles I, and in that year dedicated his Ovid to his master. In the years following he addressed each of his published works to the king, expressing in the last of them, his *Paraphrase upon the Song of Solomon*,[11] some hesitancy "for thus long continuing to make my alloy current by the impression of your name." Occasionally Sandys added a companion dedication "To the Queen" and "To the Prince."[12] A few of these dedications are in prose, but most of them are graceful little poems expressing somewhat conventionally but undoubtedly sincerely his admiration and affection for the ruling family.

It is the purpose of this paper (1) to present two hitherto unpublished "dedicatory" poems by Sandys and (2) to discuss briefly the circumstances and persons who inspired them. They are of some interest as an addition to the slender stock of his

[9] London, 1615.

[10] There is reference to George Sandys's *Dream* in a commendatory poem among the Ashmolean Mss. (38, no. 184, quoted in Hooper, p. lxxiv).

[11] London, 1641 (also cf. Hooper, p. xlvi).

[12] "To the Queen" and "To the Prince" appear in *A Paraphrase upon the Divine Poems*, 1638; other poems "To the Queen" appear in *A Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David*, 1636, and *A Paraphrase upon the Song of Solomon*, 1641. These and those to Charles vary between ten and twenty-four lines in length, usually in octosyllabic couplets.

original poems and as some indication of Sandys's interests during the 1630's beyond those already known.[13]

The two manuscript poems, *To the Queen of Bohemia* and *To his Grace of Canterbury* are bound, together with a manuscript of Sandys's *Paraphrase upon the Song of Solomon*,[14] into a copy of the 1638 edition of Sandys's *Paraphrase upon the Divine Poems*. This volume, now in the possession of the Library Company of Philadelphia (Ridgway Branch), was part of a valuable legacy of books from the Rev. Samuel Preston,[15] Rector of Chevening in Kent. The manuscripts are all signed with the initials "G. S."[16] The volume is a presentation copy to the Earl of Arundel. On the title-page, under the imprint (London, At the Bell in St. Paul's Church-yard . . .) is written in ink[17]

Ex dono Authoris
Arundell & Surry
virtutis Laus Actio.

The poet's relation to the nobleman to whom he presented the volume is bound up closely with his relation to the subject of the first of the inscribed poems. The probable relationship of the three — poet, subject, and recipient of the volume — will be clearer by considering *To the Queen of Bohemia* first.

[13] Sandys continued to show his interest in Virginia by petitioning for the post of secretary to the colony in 1632 (cf. R. B. Davis. *George Sandys, Poet-Adventurer*, in *Americana*, XXXIII, no. 2, July, 1939, pp. 180-195). He was also a member of the literary circle of Lord Falkland, Thomas Carew, Sidney Godolphin, Edmond Waller, Henry King, etc. (cf. Hooper, I, pp. lxxxv-cv, for their commendatory verses on Sandys's work, and also pp. xxxvi-xxxvii).

[14] *The Song of Solomon* was not printed until 1641, and then separately. This MS. version differs somewhat in spelling and phraseology from the separate 1641 and 1642 editions (themselves differing) and from the later collected versions (e.g., that of 1676).

[15] Cf. Austin Gray. *Benjamin Franklin's Library*, N. Y., 1937, pp. 43-44.

[16] I have compared the MS. with certain letters by George Sandys written when he was in Virginia in 1623. Though certain forms differ, I believe they *could be* the same hand. I am enclined to hold, however, that they are only "fair copie" done probably by a scrivener.

[17] Though I have examined a microfilm of the MS. parts of this volume, I am indebted to Mr. Austin K. Gray, Director of the Library Company of Philadelphia, for his personal examination of the volume and his checking of many points for me.

I.

The Queen of Bohemia was Elizabeth,[18] sister of Charles I, by her twelfth birthday subject of many poetic offerings, and after her marriage the subject of Sir Henry Wotton's tribute[19] to her as the rose among violets. Wife of Frederick V, elector palatine and titular King of Bohemia,[20] she bore the misfortunes of her husband with courage and resourcefulness. Taking refuge in 1620 with Prince Maurice of Orange at the Hague, she was the romantic inspiration as "the Queen of Hearts" to many young cavaliers who tried to assist her and her husband in regaining their throne. All efforts were in vain; the Elector died in 1632, and her troubles continued to multiply. Personally and as a symbol of the Protestant cause she excited warm sympathy and admiration, though for various reasons her brother Charles was never able to assist her to any great extent.

Elizabeth's connection with Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel,[21] is significant here. At her marriage in 1613 Arundel had carried the sword of state, and afterwards was appointed one of the four noblemen to escort her abroad. When her husband died Arundel was sent to the Hague to condole with the Queen and bring her back to England, though she refused to go. In 1636 Arundel was sent on an important mission to the Emperor in Vienna to endeavor to restore the Palatinate to Elizabeth's son. On his journey he was received in state in Holland by many notables, among them the Queen of Bohemia. When his mission failed, he asked to be recalled.

It may have been as early as this time, about 1636, that Sandys wrote his little poem to the Queen of Bohemia. From the text it appears that it might have accompanied a copy of his *Paraphrases*

[18] 1596-1662 (cf. *D.N.B.* article by A. W. Ward; also Carola Oman. *Elizabeth of Bohemia*, London, 1938).

[19] Cf. *Palgrave's Golden Treasury* and *The Oxford Book of English Verse.*

[20] Chosen because of his Protestantism.

[21] Cf. *D.N.B.* article on Arundel by E. T. Bradley.

in manuscript.[22] Or if it accompanied a printed edition of the poems, it was probably that of 1638, since the poem to the Queen appears to refer directly to the *Book of Job*, and only the *Psalms of David* had appeared in the earlier printed paraphrase of 1636. If it did accompany a printed edition, the copy might have been delivered by Arundel himself when he returned to the continent in 1641.[23] If it were the manuscript version, he may have delivered it on his mission of 1636.

Of course it is more probable that a volume of *Paraphrases* containing the dedication was carried by one of the frequent messengers passing between the courts of England and the Netherlands between 1636 and 1641. That a copy of the poem should appear in a presentation[24] volume to the Earl would indicate only Arundel's long and active attachment to Elizabeth.

Though Sandys also may have had a deep or at least sincere personal attachment to the unfortunate queen, the poem does not necessarily indicate such a condition. Sandys's affection for the Queen's brother Charles, and his position in Charles's personal retinue would be reason enough for writing the dedication. Also Sandys, like almost every other Protestant in England, was concerned that the Palatinate should be under Protestant control. She who had long been the symbol of all conquering Beauty

[22] That Sandys, like most of his contemporaries, circulated his poems in manuscript is evident. The commendatory poems prefixed to the *Paraphrases* by Falkland, Waller, Carew, etc., would indicate this. Certainly *The Song of Solomon* was circulated in MS., for in Godolphin's commendatory verses to the 1638 edition of the *Paraphrases* (in which *The Song of Solomon* does not appear) there is printed in the margin "Canticles not printed" beside a reference to Solomon's other work (cf. 1638 ed., signature xx 2 in Library Company of Philadelphia copy).

[23] When he accompanied the French queen mother to Calais, and then permanently took up his residence on the continent, in Italy.

[24] It is most probable that Sandys had the volume bound with the MS. of the *Song of Solomon* and the two dedicatory poems included at the time. The binding is contemporary calf, without the Earl's arms such as it probably would have had if Arundel had ordered the binding himself. The MS. of the *Song of Solomon* is inserted just ahead of the printed *Lamentations*. The half-title of the *Lamentations* has been removed to make way for the insertion of the MS. It is possible that Sandys sent the volume to the Earl in Italy in 1642 (Rosenbach's asserts that the binding is clearly English).

was now the symbol of distressed and even persecuted Beauty. Sandys could be a polite courtier, a strong Protestant, and a chivalrous gentleman at the same time. Whatever his reason or reasons, the poem is a graceful and sympathetic tribute:

To the Queene of Bohemia

Crowns are the sport of Fortune; but the throne
Your virtue built, is fixt; and still yo^{r} Owne.
Nor is your Glory Dimn'd by this Retreat
By that, which would have lessen'd, grown more great.
And as the never Setting Sun displaies
On all the world his ever equall-Raies
Though shady Earth on us impose her Night;
And wth her Envious Vapours cloud our Sight;
So in your Selfe you shine; Adversities
Quench not your Luster, but delude weak eyes
See howe the Righteous Job, wth torments worne
The Crown from holy David's temples torne;
Sad Sion's Daughter weeping while her Foes
Inioy their Hate, and triumph in her Woes.
Thus God his ffriends afflicts; not to destroy,
But to refine, and Conſumm̃ate their Joy.

G. S.

II.

The other poem, *To his Grace of Canterbury,* is more clearly introducing the whole or a portion of the *Paraphrases.* "This crown'd Prophet" in the poem, as given below, would appear to refer to the *Psalms* or *Ecclesiastes.*

Though there is no indication here of Arundel's relation to William Laud, there is clear evidence that Sandys is expressing more than polite admiration. The poet touches on the archbishop's strong points — his fearless crusading for his own standards, his reorganization at Oxford and gifts to the University "our Spring of Learning," and his ecclesiastical statesmanship.[25]

[25] Or so his partisans would have called Laud's conduct of affairs.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, only a little older[26] than Sandys, had many qualities in common with the poet. Admirer of learning, the churchman had been president of St. John's College and Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Reforming examination systems, reviving the college system and academic dress, founding or endowing various professorships, actually erecting many new buildings, he was one of the great scholars and educators of his age. Tyrannical in his public duties in church and state, he was nevertheless fearless and sincere, the foe of corruption. There was something in this austere soldier of the church, this ecclesiastical martinet, that the son of another archbishop,[27] and himself a soldier and adventurer and poet who attuned his lyre and his character to the authority of the scriptures, understood and applauded.

It seems clear that Sandys wrote this poem to the Archbishop before 1640, without hint of the mounting troubles of that year, which Sandys lived to see but did not write about.

To his Grace of Canterbury

Great Primate, you who at his Altar stand;
And break the Bread of Life wth a pure Hand:
Who know the leading truth, that knowledge preach
With quickning power, and by Example teach
Who through such Rocks and Gulphes, on either side,
So steadily the Sacred Veffel guide:
Repairs her bruised keile[*sic*], Close up her Rente;
New rigg and decke, wth her old Ornamente:
Who have our Spring of Learning cleanf'd above,
That her dispersed streames might slowly move:
Whose Piety is equall to the Grace
Your Title gives you, and above yo$^{\delta\epsilon}$ Place:
Free from Vain-glory, free from Avarice;
And, but in punishing, unknown to Vice:
While you yo$^{\delta}$ Maker in his Word behold,
And heavenly Oracles to Men unfold;
This crown'd Prophet in our Verse perufe:

[26] Laud born 1573, Sandys 1577.

[27] George Sandys's father was Archbishop of York under Queen Elizabeth.

And if yo$^{\delta}$ Judgement shall confirm our Muſe,
Be you the Hand to raiſe it to the Head:
Then, though for Gold, she render full en[in?] Lead;
If by the Effigies of his Grace imprest,
Twill Current grow, if not indure the Test
G. S.

Of these four — Elizabeth, Laud, Arundel, and Sandys — only the widowed Queen of Bohemia lived to see the execution of one Charles and the restoration of another. Sandys died peacefully in the country in Kent in 1644, Laud by the headsman's axe in 1645, and Arundel in exile in Italy in 1646. The three men, though staunch supporters of the Stuarts and lovers of art[28] and learning, had many of the austerities and much of the sturdy independence of character commonly considered more typical of the men of the regime which overthrew their own. And even Elizabeth was not welcomed when another more light-hearted Stuart returned to England.

In these short dedications[29] George Sandys, cavalier who loved the scriptures, adventurer who made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, was complimenting two people who stood for the Stuart qualities he most admired — sincerity and orthodoxy in religion and steadfastness of purpose. Sandys presented a volume which contained them and his *Paraphrase upon the Song of Solomon* to a fellow cavalier who had the same ideas and qualities, and was in addition the great art collector of his generation. It is a gesture characteristic of the poet who was Gentleman of the Privy Chamber to Charles I.

[28] Particularly Arundel (cf. the various accounts of his life and collections).

[29] Though Sandys is remembered as a forerunner of Dryden in the use of the heroic couplet, the use of that form in these two poems signifies little. Most of Sandys's poetic dedications are in octosyllabic couplets; he does use the decasyllabic couplet in those prefixed to several of his longer works (e.g. to the *Paraphrases upon the Divine Poems*). There are more felicitous examples of his heroic in his longer poems than in these occasional verses.

Mr. Roosevelt Continues, as President and Author

By Frederick B. Adams, Jr.

AFTER reading Mr. Willkie's current best-seller, *Around My World in Eighty Days*, the *New Yorker* felt compelled to warn him that it might cost him the Presidency, because, it said

> . . . In the American voter's mind, there is nothing so untrustworthy as the author of a book. The citizen of the hinterland is firmly convinced that book authors are shady, suspiciously glib people who live in sin in New York, mostly on absinthe, and he would no more vote for one than he would vote for Tommy Manville. Heretofore our Presidential aspirants have always been well aware of this. Among the recent Presidents, Hoover had nothing against his name but a couple of engineering monographs, Harding had never written anything but editorials, and Coolidge not only forewent writing until he was safely past the Presidency but also just about forewent talking. Even Roosevelt, a more intellectual type than most, turned over the editing of his state papers to a friend to avoid having his name on the fall lists . . .

Before his election to the Presidency, Mr. Roosevelt had no reputation as an author. For a few weeks one spring he had written a column of news commentary for a Georgia paper and proved to himself that nobody faced with such a stint could say something worthwhile every day; he had written introductions to several books about the Navy and sailing; he had edited the Records of the Town of Hyde Park for the Dutchess County Historical Society; a speech to the boys at Milton Academy had been issued as a small book entitled *Whither Bound?*; and in a very thin but enthusiastic volume in 1928 he had saluted Gov-

ernor Smith as *The Happy Warrior*, and wished him Godspeed on the road to the White House.

On March 4, 1933, as people listened to the *Inaugural Address* they knew that this was masterful handling of our language, not just a speech by another President. It was impressively designed and powerfully phrased. To-day its memorable sentences have become as historic as the actions which they foreshadowed.

There are no less than six texts of the first *Inaugural Address*, because the President made some last-minute improvements in his manuscript and then delivered his message with such fervor that he deviated from this manuscript in several places.

The first of these texts, printed from an unrevised copy of the President's manuscript by the Government Printing Office in Washington, was issued for the most part to newspapers and periodicals, and government officials. Some were inscribed and given away by the President himself.

The second published version, printed from a stenographic transcript of the address, was first published in book form in *Looking Forward*, where it constitutes the last chapter. For many reasons, it seemed important to issue this book during the early days of March, 1933. Rather than wait for the official version of the *Address* to reach them from Washington, the John Day Company decided to use the stenographic transcript as reported in the newspapers, but from some cause which has never been explained they omitted the paragraph referring to the program of legislation which the President was preparing to urge on a special session of Congress. This incomplete transcript was rushed to the printers, the type set, and the sheets printed. On March 10th, 130 copies of the book bound in paper wrappers were sent out to reviewers with a release date of March 16th. An advance copy was also sent to the President who required that some corrections be made. The publishers did their best to comply, and were successful in recalling all but about ten of the review copies. One of

the revisions was in the concluding paragraph of the *Inaugural Address*, resulting in text number three.

Meanwhile Mr. Roland Wood and his associates at the Harbor Press, quick to appreciate the significance of the *Address*, published two small editions of it in rapid succession; 30 copies in brown and black ink, 150 copies in blue and black. They printed the complete stenographic transcript, and thus became the first publishers to put into permanent book form the text as listeners actually heard it delivered.

What appeared to be the final word on the *Inaugural Address* was said by the President himself (not all authors are so fortunate) in an introductory note which precedes text number five in *On Our Way*, also issued by the John Day Company. The note says: "For the sake of the record and because I find a number of variations in texts of the Inaugural Address which have been heretofore published, the text here given is the correct one." This version was taken from the final corrected copy of the President's manuscript which he had with him on the rostrum when he delivered the *Address*. It represents the intermediate stage between the unaltered text published by the Government Printing Office and the stenographic transcript printed by the Harbor Press. Omitting from consideration the two bastard texts of *Looking Forward*, there are about two dozen differences between the GPO text and this very official text; and half as many between the Harbor and official texts.

The GPO text was altered by the President during the course of the morning of March 4th to correct grammatical errors and to make possible a more fluent and effective delivery. For example, the opening paragraph in the first version reads:

> I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels.

When the *Address* was revised before delivery this paragraph was changed to:

> This is a day of national consecration. I am certain that on this day my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our people impels.

The paragraph as finally delivered from the rostrum is substantially the same as the foregoing, the only difference being the addition of a connective "and" after the sentence "This is a day of national consecration."

Other differences between the three texts are of a similar nature, with one amusing exception. The *Address* as delivered contained a parenthetical "my friends" which did not appear in the other two versions.

The President stated in 1935 that to the best of his knowledge the *Inaugural Address* as contained in *On Our Way* is the first printing of the correct version. Was it also the last? Because when a text was selected for inclusion in the second volume of the *Public Papers and Addresses*, the wheel turned full circle, and the original GPO text number one was used, with one emendation in the paragraph calling for strict supervision of banking, credits, and investments. So: text number six.

In the quiet days before rationing and priorities, the misfortunes that attended the publication of *Looking Forward* and *On Our Way* looked overwhelming. I have previously told the story in full detail in the *Colophon* (New Series Volume I, Number 4). I have nothing to add to what I said at that time about *Looking Forward*, but in regard to *On Our Way* enough more information has come to light to make revision advisable.

This book was published in the spring of 1934. Twelve sets of sheets were bound in paper wrappers; of these, seven were allotted to reviewers and the balance kept for salesmen and executives of the company. At the time, the President was taking

a brief vacation cruise on board Vincent Astor's *Nourmahal*, and several days elapsed before a cloth-bound advance copy of the book could be got to him. In the interim, one of the salesmen discovered that the first line on page 16 also appeared, by some ink-stained Gremlin's prank, as the first line on page 15. Reviewers' copies were easily corrected by drawing a pencil through the offending line, but unfortunately for the trade edition, a substantial majority of the first printing of 30,000 copies had already been run through the press. Nothing for it but to insert a cancel leaf — something of a task where about 20,000 books are concerned. On the other third of the run, the correction was made in the plates, and copies of the first edition therefore occur with the correction on a cancel and also with the correction on an integral sheet. All copies I have seen with early inscription or acquisition dates have the cancel leaf. There were apparently no other errors, and the book was mailed to distributors on April 3rd, well ahead of the scheduled publication date, April 12th.

The President's copy was sent to him on April 2nd. On April 8th, he sent the publishers a radiogram from the *Nourmahal* calling attention to an error on page x of the Foreword. The phrase "abolition of private party" should obviously read "abolition of private property." The suggestion was made that erratum slips be printed, and this was done. The slip reads:

ERRATUM
Foreword, page x, line 13, should
read "of private property."

Erratum slips were sent to the bookstores for insertion in any copies they still had on hand (in some cases John Day representatives went to bookstores and inserted the slips themselves), and they were loosely inserted in all copies then in the publisher's stock.

Shortly after the publication of the trade edition, a special edition was prepared for presentation purposes only. This was

limited to thirty-five copies, of which twelve were for the President and members of his family, eighteen for the Cabinet and the White House Secretariat, four for executives of the John Day Company, and one to be retained by the binder. All but the binder's copy were shipped to the White House on April 17th, to be inscribed by the President. At this crucial moment another error was discovered: there was no sense to the phrase on page 162: "It is because I am willing to live myself, or to have my children or grandchildren live, under an alien flag or an alien form of government . . ." A "not" ought to be inserted after the fifth word, and the White House so advised the John Day Company on May 10th. Meanwhile the President, in signing the special edition, took care personally to correct the two textual errors. I have examined six copies and all have these autograph corrections and, incidentally, a cancel leaf corresponding to the original correction in the trade edition.

The John Day Company agreed to correct this last error by insertion of a second erratum slip, and copies actually exist with the two slips.

An English edition published in May by Faber & Faber Ltd. perpetuated the error in the Foreword, but not the other. The book was also published in Germany as *Unser Weg* and in France as *Sur La Bonne Voie.*

Looking Forward and *On Our Way* were both expositions of the philosophy and actions of the New Deal. They were more propaganda than history, since for the most part they were made up from texts that had already appeared in newspapers and official records. It remained for Judge Samuel I. Rosenman and the President to work out a better method of presenting the basic historical material of the Roosevelt Revolution, and this was done for the first five volumes of the *Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt.* Here the formal addresses, speeches and executive orders were supplemented by transcripts of extemporaneous speeches and press conferences. These last afford about

equal parts of instruction and entertainment. For each volume the President wrote a special introduction, and, for some items, copious explanatory notes. Random House undertook the publication, and entrusted the layout to Joseph Blumenthal of the Spiral Press.

The unusual readibility of the volumes is the result of painstaking editorial labor by Judge Rosenman, who did, as far as we can tell at this date, a magnificent job of selecting his material. This was complemented by Mr. Blumenthal's impeccable arrangements, which were copied by the Macmillan Company when they undertook to publish the next four volumes covering the President's second term.

From a bibliographical point of view these nine volumes are very dull: there is nothing wrong with them, nothing unusual about them that calls for comment.They are complete, competent, and final, and the only question about them is whether there will be four more or eight more.

The President's avocational interests have not been submerged during these busy years. His stamp collection, his detective stories and his games of solitaire have not occupied all his leisure hours. He has written introductions to books on such subjects as *Stratford Hall* (the Great House of the Lees), and early American Naval history. He has supplied valuable help to Captain Dudley Knox on his series of publications of our early Naval records and he has edited another volume of local documentary material for the Dutchess County Historical Society, published in 1940 under the title *Records of Crum Elbow Precinct Dutchess County New York 1738-1761.*

Until the day of Pearl Harbor, the President found much needed relaxation in his salt-water cruises. Fortunately, these are documented by informal logs, to each of which the Commander-in-Chief has applied his editorial eye, with his vigilant respect for the source material of future historians, and, be it said, with prankish humor about some of the goings-on of the Presidential

party. These logs have been issued in very small editions, chiefly by the Navy in the form of photo-offset reproductions from typewritten copy. The Log of the *Sewanna* cruise was printed at the GPO.

Trip of the President — Summer 1934 — USS Houston	July 2 – Aug. 2, 1934
Log of the Cruise of President Franklin D. Roosevelt aboard the Schooner Yacht Sewanna	July 14 – July 28, 1936
The Cruise of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to South America and the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, Buenos Aires, Argentina USS Indianapolis	Nov. 18 – Dec. 15, 1936
Log of the Cruise of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Gulf of Mexico USS Potomac	Apr. 29 – May 11, 1937
Log of the Cruise of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Dry Tortugas, Florida USS Potomac	Nov. 29 – Dec. 6, 1937
Log of the Cruise of the President on board USS Philadelphia	Apr. 30 – May 8, 1938
The Inspection Cruise and Fishing Expedition of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on board USS Houston	July 16 – Aug. 9, 1938
Cruise of the President on board USS Tuscaloosa	August 12 – 22, 1939
Log of the President's Inspection Cruise through the West Indies on board the USS Tuscaloosa	December 3 – 14, 1940
Log of the President's Inspection Trip and Cruise on board USS Potomac	Mar. 19 – April 1, 1941

Many individual speeches or groups of public papers have been published by commercial houses, and since information about these is readily available from standard library sources, I shall not go into them here.

Others have been published by special organizations in furtherance of their own aims. I cannot tell how complete this list may be, but at any rate, here are some of the organizations responsible for first edition material in the English language by the President:

Jusserand Memorial Committee
Boy Scouts of America
Woodrow Wilson Foundation
The Democratic National Committee
The Republican National Committee
Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc.
The British Government
The Canadian Government
American Council on Public Affairs
New York Life Insurance Company
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
German Library of Information
United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission

By far the widest circulated of any of the President's writings in his introduction to the Servicemen's *Bible* supplied to every member of the Armed Forces by the Gideons and the American Bible Society.

The most elusive publications of these Presidential years are the privately printed editions of various addresses which Mr. Roosevelt has regarded as milestones in his three terms and therefore deserving of special circulation in the councils of the mighty. On all of these, which have been printed at his own expense, the President has conspired with Mr. Giegengack, the Public Printer, to assure first-class design for each book or pamphlet, for their author is a lover of books in the fullest sense of the phrase. As you know, it is difficult to assemble such information in these times, and I have not been able to examine all the material, but I believe this list of the special editions is reasonably complete:

Veto Message [on the Bonus Bill], May 22, 1935.

Address of Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the United States; Chautauqua, N. Y. August 14, 1936.

Edition of 50 copies. Another edition of this same speech was printed with the title: *The Address of the President of the United States at Chautauqua, New York on August 14, 1936 on the Subjects of the Foreign Relations of the United States and of War.* I have been unable thus far to identify the source of this pamphlet; it

was issued without date, or place, or publisher, or printer. This is the prophetic speech in which the President said that he was becoming more concerned over international problems than domestic ones.

Addresses of the President of the United States on the Occasion of his Visit to South America, November and December, 1936.

Published December, 1937, in an edition of 75 copies.

Address of the President at the Ceremony of the 150th Anniversary of the Commencement of the First Congress, March 4, 1939.

Contrasting the long history of American democracy with foreign despotism.

Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, July 19, 1940 to January 20, 1941.

Published December, 1941, in an edition of 75 copies. The President was inscribing some of these a few hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, 1942.

Published December, 1942, in an edition of 100 copies.

In addition to these, I am informed that the three Inaugural Addresses have been printed as separate pamphlets, and may be bound together for distribution by the President as this year's Christmas book.

Miss Margaret L. Suckley of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Miss Grace G. Tully, the President's private secretary, and Mr. John Valentine, a fellow FDR collector, have supplied much information for this paper, which I most gratefully acknowledge. And since much of the information passed on to me by the two ladies came from the very fountainhead, special thanks are due to President Roosevelt for his unfailing assistance.

Bibliographical Notes

English Books, 1475-1800

BRETON, NICHOLAS (? 1545-? 1626). A Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters.

The 1607 issue of Nicholas Breton's *A Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters* seems to have been printed before the 1606 edition. The same woodcut has been used for both title-pages but cracks which appear in the 1606 and widen in the 1609 are absent in the 1607.

The 1607 issue was printed by I. W.; the 1606 by R. B. I. W. may be identified as John Windet because later reprints of *A Poste* are done by William Stansby to whom the Windet business went in 1611.

R. B. may be identified as Richard Bradocke since the black-letter font used to print the 1606 *Poste* has the same typographical peculiarities as the font used by Bradocke in 1606 to print Henry Hoddesdon's *A Treatise Concerning Death and Resurrection*. Even individual sorts may be identified in both texts: for example, a misshapen m (last minim neither ascends nor descends far enough) in *A Treatise* p. F8 line 3, "com*m*itted" and in *A Poste* p. C3 line 3, "hu*m*ble;" likewise a broken h (the second stroke closes at the bottom and is open at the top) in *A Treatise* sig. O line 21, "*h*ath" and in *A Poste* sig. B line 1, "*h*ead."

— FRANK SULLIVAN

Eastern European Literature

NEKTARIOS, patriarch of Jerusalem (1605-1685).

ΤΟΥ̃ | ΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΤΆ- | ΤΟΥ ΚΑῚ ΣΟΦΩ- | ΤΆΤΟΥ | ΠΑΤΡΙΆΡΧΟΥ | ΤΗ̃Σ ΜΕΓΆΛΗΣ | Καὶ ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱερουσαλὴμ κυρίου | Νεκταρίου πρὸς τὰς προσκο- | μισθείσας θέσεις παρὰ τῶν ἘΝ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΎ- | ΜΟΙΣ ΦΡΑΤΌΡΩΝ | ΔΙᾺ ΠΈΤΡΟΥ | ΤΟΥ̃ ΑΥΤΩ̃Ν ΜΑΪΣΤΟΡΟΣ | περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ πάπα | ΑΝΤΙΡΡΗΣΙΣ. | Τυπωθεῖσα νῦν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ σεβασμίᾳ Πατριαρχικῇ καὶ αὐθεν- | τικῇ μονῇ τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων καὶ πρωτοκορυφαίων | ἀποστόλων, τῇ καλουμένῃ Τζετατζούϊα | κατὰ τὸ : ᾳχπβ [*i. e.* 1682] : ἔτος τὸ | σωτήριον. ἐν μηνὶ Ἰουλίῳ. | Εν Γιασίῳ τῆς Μολδαβίας.

12 p. *l.*, 255, [4] p. 272 x 202 mm.

Collation by signatures: 12 leaves unsigned, I⁴, A-Ω⁴, a-ϵ⁴(—ϵ4), ϛ-θ⁴, 4 leaves (—4) unsigned.

The two cancelled leaves (ϵ_4 between p. 230 and 231, and leaf at end) are blank and not included in the paging.

Typographical ornament on verso of t.-p.

Note on p. 255: Ἐτυπώθη παρὰ τοῦ ἐν Ἱερομονάχοις Μητροφάνους.

The first book from the press of Dosetheus as well as the first modern Greek book printed at Jassy, in the province of Moldavia in Rumania. Dosetheus also edited the work and included a two-page biographical sketch of the author.

Nektarios, patriarch of Jerusalem, was born in Crete of Greek parents from Peloponnesus (whence his secular name of Nikolaos Pelopides). Educated at the Saint Catharine monastery, Sinai, he became a monk and took the name in religion of Nektarios. About 1660 he was appointed abbot of the Saint Catharine monastery but on his way to Jerusalem to be consecrated he was informed of his election to the patriarchal throne at Jerusalem following the death of his predecessor Països. He then returned to Sinai where he was consecrated to the Patriarchate in April, 1661. As early as 1666 he was anxious to be relieved because of his age, and was succeeded in 1669 by Dosetheus.

During Nektarios's incumbency certain Romish emissaries were very active in Palestine, trying to persuade the Greek Orthodox Christians (then under the yoke of the Turks) to unite with the Church at Rome. Particularly active was a Spanish Franciscan named Peter, who distributed five tracts in defense of the Papal authority. In reply to these tracts Nektarios wrote his greatest work, the above Περὶτῆς Ἀρχῆς τοῦ Πάπα Ἀντίῤῥησις, in which he gives a fair refutation of the principles laid down in the Roman Catholic tracts: 1st, of the unity in the primitive church; 2d, of the harmony of the two principal divisions of the church in the apostolic time; 3d, of the sole authenticity of the church of Rome; 4th, of the necessity of the monarchical government of the church.

The text proper of Nektarios terminates on p. 230, with the word "Τέλος" at the foot of the page. The subsequent material is extraneous, collected and edited by Dosetheus and consisting mainly of material against the Council of Florence (1438-1439) and against the Jesuits. Evidently, it was originally the intention to terminate the volume with p. 230, which would explain the cancelled leaf between pp. 230 and 231.

Concerning the press, Dosetheus states that when he arrived in Jassy in 1680 and found that the Moldavians there had a press but that the Greeks had none, his heart burned within him. But God sent him a certain Vlach monk named Metrophanes, to whom Dosetheus gave 600 Piastres, with which he (Metrophanes) erected a new press. Then Dosetheus supplied him with paper, the necessary expenses, and the manuscript of Nektarios on the Pope. Contrary to all expectations, the book was printed, and was distributed unbound.

There are copies of this rare book in the Greek National Library, Athens, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, in the British Museum, and now in the Burnam Classical Library, University of Cincinnati.

A Latin edition of this work (also rare), translated by Pierre Allix, appeared in London in 1702.

— Emory C. Skarshaug

Americana

Trinidad Weekly Courant.

A datum on early printing in Trinidad under the British regime is provided by a copy of the *Trinidad Weekly Courant* in Vol. C. O. 295/2 in the British Public Record Office. I have recently received information from the authorities of that Office to the effect that this issue, dated Monday, February 13, 1802, is numbered Vol. 3, No. 118. This would point to the probability that, had publication been regular, the first issue would have been published on November 16, 1799. There is no imprint giving names of editor or printer, but in one of the advertisements the printing office of Hargrove and Carpenter, Port of Spain, is mentioned.

— Douglas C. McMurtrie

AUTHORS OF PAPERS IN THIS ISSUE

Major Hamilton Vaughan Bail, formerly Treasurer of The Grolier Club, is now in the United States Army.

Dr. Edwin B. Knowles, Jr., is Instructor in English at Queens College, Flushing, N. Y. He received his Ph.D. from New York University in 1938, his thesis being *The Influence of Don Quixote on English Literature. 1605-1660.*

Lieut.(j.g.) Richard Beale Davis, U.S.N.R., Associate Professor of English in the University of South Carolina (now on leave of absence), is the executive officer of the Navy V-12 Unit, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Virginia.

Mr. Frederick B. Adams, Jr., Vice-President of The Grolier Club, was one of the editors of the *Colophon.*

Major Bail's paper was read at the Society's meeting held in New York City on January 16, 1943; Mr. Adams's paper was read at the meeting held in New York City on June 18, 1943; the other two papers published in this issue were not presented at meetings of the Society.

Reviews

HAZEN, A. T., and KIRBY, J. P. *A Bibliography of the Strawberry Hill Press with a Record of the Prices at which Copies have been Sold, By A. T. Hazen. Together with a Bibliography and Census of the Detached Pieces By A. T. Hazen and J. P. Kirby.* New Haven, Yale University Press . . . 1942. 300 pp. Front., facsims. 10 x 7¼ inches. $10.00.

The books and fugitive pieces printed at Strawberry Hill seem to have been made to order for the collector. The items are not too numerous to frighten him; they are rare enough to stimulate his cupidity, but not so rare as to deter him from the quest; the prices they fetch will not be paid by the impecunious "student," but they are not so great as to limit the collecting of the items to people of wealth.

The Strawberry Hill imprints have been collectors' desiderata and the subjects of bibliographers' researches from the eighteenth century down to our own day. Thomas Kirgate, whom Horace Walpole engaged to print the books and other items produced at his private press (many of the imprints include the words "Printed by Thomas Kirgate"), kept everything that Walpole gave him and acquired everything of Walpole interest on which he could lay his hands. His annotations are found in many of the pieces, and he may be regarded as the first bibliographer of the Press. Since the early nineteenth century, booksellers' check-lists or bibliographers' studies of the items have been written by George Baker, Thomas Frognall Dibdin, John Major, J. McCreery, John Martin, George Robins, H. G. Bohn, H. B. Wheatley, Austin Dobson and Paget Toynbee. In going over this considerable volume of published material Messrs. Hazen and Kirby have separated the wheat from the chaff, and, as Mr. Lewis writes in his preface, "This book makes waste-paper of virtually everything written about the Strawberry Hill Press since Walpole's and Kirgate's day." Hampered by the war, however, Messrs. Hazen and Kirby do not claim that they have covered everything completely and definitively. For instance, of the thirty-six books which are assumed to have been printed at the Press, Mr. Hazen has been unable to see copies of two, and of these he can state merely that they "may well be genuine productions

of the Press." The description of these two items and the definition of their status is a bit of unfinished work — perhaps to be completed after the war.

The incentive for the compilation of the *Bibliography* was of course the availability of the unrivalled collection of material by and relating to Horace Walpole and the Strawberry Hill Press formed by Mr. Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis of Farmington, Connecticut (and more recently of Washington, D. C.). Originally planned as a catalogue of the imprints of the Press at Farmington, the scope of the work was expanded by Mr. Hazen to that of a bibliography.

According to the latter, Kirgate "may be considered both as the villain and as the hero" of this *Bibliography*. Kirgate is believed to have made unauthorized reprints of some of the Strawberry Hill items at the time of, or shortly after, Walpole's death in 1797. Kirgate's "forgeries," as well as those made by others in the nineteenth century, have led the compilers to make a careful study of the papers and types used in the items they have examined, in order that they might establish and date both the genuine and the fraudulent pieces.

The *Bibliography* is divided into two main sections. The first contains chronologically arranged descriptions of thirty-six books believed to have been printed at the Press, and notes concerning six books, sometimes listed as Strawberry Hill items, which Mr. Hazen believes were not printed there. The second section deals with ninety-five detached pieces (broadsides, folders, etc.), a few of which are not believed to be Strawberry Hill items. Mr. Kirby did much of the work on the detached pieces, but the final responsibility in presenting the information concerning them, and the other items as well, has been Mr. Hazen's.

In describing a book printed at the Press the compilers have arranged their material in the following order: (1) number assigned by Bohn in Lowndes's *Bibliographer's Manual*, 1864; (2) quotations regarding the item from eighteenth-century sources (*Journal of the Printing Office*, Walpole's letters, etc.); (3) format and size; (4) collation (signatures and pagination); (5) plates; (6) states and variants; (7) other editions; and (8) copies. Some of the books require notes of a special character not comprised in the headings here listed. As many of the detached pieces and the title-page of each book are reproduced in facsimile (printed from line cuts), it has not been necessary to print the titles in detail in the text: a summary title and date are printed at the beginning of the description of each item. Admirable work has been done in listing and tracing the prove-

nances of copies. Of some of the rarer books and of most of the detached pieces the attempt has been made to list all known copies. Besides the names of successive owners, the prices paid at various times have been recorded, including the prices paid by Mr. Lewis for items in his collection.

To a user of bibliographies who likes to see entries printed in the conventional arrangement (verbatim title, collation, notes), it may by a little confusing upon examining this *Bibliography* to find the entries beginning with long quotations from early sources in small type, followed by the collation and other material. The serious user, however, could scarcely claim that he was unable to find what he was after.

The work is provided with an index of owners, and a general index; the latter is primarily an alphabetical guide to the various pieces described.

It is intimated in Mr. Hazen's Introduction that Messrs. Lewis and Kirby are preparing a study of the books from Walpole's library, and that Mr. Hazen is undertaking a bibliography of Walpole's own writings. We wish them all good luck.

G. L. M.

Anthoensen, Fred, and Chaplin, Ruth A. *Types and Bookmaking, containing Notes on the Books Printed at the Southworth-Anthoensen Press By Fred Anthoensen and a Bibliographical Catalogue By Ruth A. Chaplin. With Specimens of its Work, Types, Borders &c., &c., &c.* Portland, Maine, The Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1943. x, 170 pp. Illus., facsims., partly colored printing specimens, specimens of types, borders, ornaments, etc. 10 x 7 inches. $7.50.

A fugue is to music what a bibliography is to printing. The composer who can keep his melodies running in orderly cataracts of sound is very like the printer who, working in a dozen languages and as many types, can produce a descriptive list of books in which lion and lamb both give (and take) the impress of good neighbors. In Fred Anthoensen of Portland, Maine, we have just such a printer — one of those never numerous spirits to whom bookmaking is life itself. Perhaps one should say life and livelihood, for as active head of the Southworth-Anthoensen Press, Mr. Anthoensen is at once artisan and business man.

In its 200-odd pages this friendliest of small quartos presents a life history of the Press and a summary of its book output during the past twenty years. Let it be said at once that this book when opened stays open — not sullenly or rigidly, but relaxedly as if glad to be read. Its paper is a thin, opaque laid, bulking just over half an inch, and resting so lightly in the hand as to require neither table nor lectern.

The text opens with a discriminating foreword by Lawrence C. Wroth of the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, who welcomes this book because of the many printing achievements it records and because it provides "a guide to current practices and standards for the typographical historian of the future." Then come seventy pages of "Notes on the Books" by their printer; and "A Bibliographical Catalogue" of some sixty pages by Miss Ruth A. Chaplin, head reader of the Press. In the remaining space are shown specimen pages from the books, with additional examples tipped in on original papers; Charles Capon's press marks for the printing house; specimens of the original types in the Press's armory; a showing of typographic ornaments, borders and printer's flowers; and a list of the sixteen keepsakes printed within the last six years for the friends of the Press. The colophon declares the book to have been set in Linotype Baskerville, and prints Mr. Capon's sympathetic portrait of John Baskerville, as if to reassert Mr. Anthoensen's abiding affection for a master printer and type designer of the past.

Miss Chaplin's bibliography is clarity itself, each item carefully and concisely described. Arranged chronologically, each entry opens (in roman) with its bracketed numeral and the fully quoted title, and is followed (in smaller roman) by collation, colophon, leaf size, binding, paper and type; with final remarks (in italic) as to special editions or bindings, or awards of merit received.*

The Southworth-Anthoensen Press had its beginning in the private press of the Rev. Francis Southworth, who with his four sons printed a religious paper and tracts for the seafaring men in the port of Portland, Maine. Mr. Anthoensen joined the Press in 1901 as a compositor, and by 1917 became its managing director. He had no "out-of-the-state" customer until 1921, when a prize awarded him in a blotter contest by the *American Printer* brought his work to the notice of Edward F. Stevens of Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. Stevens thereupon placed an order, and the Press continues to print for Pratt Institute to this day. But from 1921 onward it became plain that the Press was destined for more of what a New Englander would call "foreign" trade.

When he took over the firm's direction, Mr. Anthoensen found the types in the cases unsuited for fine printing. He had to start afresh, and here his devoted study of European printing became decisive for the firm's

* This self-heckling reviewer wonders: Why do such listings leave out the published prices? A generation hence this will seem an important omission to the social historian who will surely wish to know what a reader had to pay for a book printed by Updike or Grabhorn or Anthoensen.

future. Admiring the clarity of eighteenth-century English printing for "a grace and gaiety not found in any other period," he refurnished his cases with half a dozen types "chosen chiefly for their historic origin, which were seemingly beyond criticism for beauty and utility." These included the types of Anton Janson (dating from 1670) William Caslon (1722), John Bell (1788), Binny & Ronaldson (1800), Joseph Fry's italic (1766), A. D. Farmer's Old Style italic (1858); and Union Pearl (1690), the first known English decorated letter. Each of these was cast for the Press from the original matrices. For the bulk of its book work the plant now relies upon Caslon from various sources, and upon Scotch Roman, Baskerville, Janson, and Granjon.

In 1931 was added the new Linotype cutting of Baskerville, a face which in Mr. Anthoensen's opinion "has sufficient inherent nobility and practical usefulness to serve in place of all the rest, should such need arise." Of John Baskerville's first book, the *Virgil* of 1757, Mr. Anthoensen says that it created a new form of printing, the "modern" style, adding: "Since Baskerville was a writing master, he was probably influenced by calligraphic models in the use of continuous curves. His design is, therefore, characterized by a fluent line, as employed by the eighteenth-century writing masters. In his italic there is nothing of that cramped character seen in the italics of other foundries of his time. Their obliqueness is less pronounced, and a whole page printed with Baskerville's italic is not wearisome."

Altogether, the style of the Press has a close spiritual kinship to Baskerville's; and when this is understood, the resultant quality of its printing seems almost predestined. In an age when advertising notions have crept into book designing, it takes courage to resist the preachers of "punch" and "eye-appeal." Mr. Anthoensen has not even bothered to resist them. He has ignored them, preferring to keep his books uncluttered with "spinach." Yet his output, all twenty years of it, has that timeless look of perennial freshness which only logic and clarity can evoke.

The Press has had its share of honors, the first citation as one of the *Fifty Books of the Year* coming for James Bone's *The London Perambulator*, 1925. To date the Press has won some twenty of these awards. Distinguished work has been done on many volumes for the Limited Editions Club — notably Balzac's *Droll Stories*, a *Rabelais* and a *Plutarch*, all three in collaboration with W. A. Dwiggins. In Charles Edey Fay's *Mary Celeste*, 1942, the chapters open under a swelled rule à la Baskerville, and the entire text has the luminous quality of Anthoensen at his best, an oceanic

freshness heightened by Rudolph Ruzicka's four-color wood engraving (reproduced in the bibliography). Another tip-in is the opening signature of the latest Keepsake, Carl J. Weber's *Thomas Hardy in Maine*. Its frontispiece is Percy Grassby's sensitive wood engraving of the house on the edge of Egdon Heath in which Hardy was born. It would be hard to find finer workmanship or deeper affection in any contemporary print.

Since this notice must end somewhere, let it end with a word about Anthoensen's powers in the field of bibliography, as revealed in A. S. W. Rosenbach's *Early American Children's Books*, 1933, Russell H. Kettel's *Early American Rooms*, 1936, and Margaret Bingham Stillwell's *Incunabula in American Libraries*, 1940. Any printer who can succeed within this exacting range need never hesitate over any job. This range, including as it does three prime divisions of our civilization — the wonder of childhood, the charm of home decoration and the survival of learning from the cradle-years of printing — calls not merely for a printer but for a civilized artisan who must within himself contain the qualities of a universal culture. Fred Anthoensen thus assumes rank among printing's elect and dedicated, one who has by instinct known the truth of Updike's dictum, that "self-effacement is the politeness of printers." The like dignity and restraint are to be noted in the more ephemeral printing of the Press. Its civilizing influence deserves a like recording; and the present writer knows he is not alone in hoping for a companion volume showing the general style of its humbler job printing. Such a gallery of bread-and-butter tasks would hold an equal interest for Dr. Wroth's "typographical historian of the future."

PAUL STANDARD

Medievalia et Humanistica, An American Journal for the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Fasciculus primus. [published at Boulder, Colorado. Managing Editor: S. Harrison Thomson, 3939 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado]. 10 x 6⅞ inches. $1.50 per fascicle.

With the appearance of the first fascicle of *Medievalia et Humanistica*, a new periodical makes its beginning. Under the guidance of a distinguished Board of Editors, of which Professor S. Harrison Thomson is the Managing Editor, *Medievalia et Humanistica* promises to be one of the most interesting — and one of the most learned — of the newer journals. Since the periodical will cover not only the era of the manuscript but also that of the earliest printed books as well, it can be confidently expected that in future issues *Medievalia et Humanistica* will publish papers of great value in the field of bibliography. The articles in the first issue range, in point of

time, from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries and include two papers which are timely and which, in the present state of the world, must (or, at least, should) be of interest to all of us. These are *Magnates and Community of the Realm in Parliament, 1264-1327* by William A. Morris and *The Origins of Modern Balance-of-Power Politics* by Ernest W. Nelson.

If we agree with Webster's definition that bibliography includes "the history or description of books and manuscripts," the article by Professor B. L. Ullman on *The Dedication Copy of Giovanni Dominici's Lucula Noctis—A Landmark in the History of the Italian Renaissance* may certainly claim to be of interest to the bibliographer. In this brilliant paper, Professor Ullman recounts the story of his discoveries concerning a manuscript of the *Lucula Noctis* which was brought to his office by a well-known London bookseller. In this manuscript there are numerous marks and marginal notations calling attention to grammatical mistakes and errors of spelling, vocabulary, citation, etc., and to Professor Ullman goes the credit for discovering that the annotator was the great Renaissance scholar, Coluccio Salutati. The *Lucula Noctis*, together with the letters by Dominici and Salutati written about it, is a work of great importance for the development of the Renaissance since this series of documents deals with the value of the study of the Classics and of the ability to write good Latin, which Dominici had attacked and which Salutati proceeded to defend with utmost vigor. The manuscript, now MS. 831 of the Library of the University of Chicago, is clearly of the greatest importance and interest.

It is sincerely to be hoped that *Medievalia et Humanistica* will meet with the success that the excellence of its articles deserves and that it will prove useful to the students of bibliography. Since the *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, *La Bibliofilia*, *Philobiblon* and similar periodicals too numerous to mention no longer appear, there are few journals that include articles strictly (or partially) of bibliographical interest and the new venture should help to make good a part of this deficiency. It will be a welcome addition to the periodical room of any reference library worthy of the name.

CURT F. BÜHLER